

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER
AND
RELIGIOUS MISCELLANY.

JANUARY, 1853.

ART. I. — RECENT ASPECTS OF JUDAISM.*

THE Jewish race has been for thousands of years the great puzzle of history, and many as have been the guesses at a solution, we shall probably be obliged to

* 1. *Satzungen und Gebräuche des talmudisch-rabbinischen Judenthums. Ein Handbuch für Juristen, Staatsmänner, Theologen und Geschichtsforscher.* Von DR. J. F. SCHRÖDER. Bremen: A. D. Geisler. 1851. 8vo. pp. xii., 678.

2. *Bibliotheca Judaica.* Von DR. JULIUS FÜRST. Leipzig: Engelmann. 8vo. Erster Theil, A-H. 1849. pp. viii., 419. Zweiter Theil, I-M. 1851. pp. vi., 409.

3. *Philosophie und philosophische Schriftsteller der Juden.* S. MUNK, mit Anmerkungen von DR. B. BEER. Leipzig: H. Hunger. 1852. 12mo. pp. vi., 120.

4. *Eighteen Treatises from the Mishna.* Translated by Rev. D. A. DE SOLA and Rev. M. J. RAPHAEL. London: Sherwood & Co. 1843. 8vo. pp. iv., 368.

5. *Twelve Sermons by DR. GOTTHOLD SALOMON.* From the German by ANNA MARIA GOLDSMID. London: Murray. 1839. 8vo. pp. viii., 247.

6. *Kohleth. Eine Auswahl gottesdienstlicher Vorträge.* Von LEOPOLD STEIN. Frankfurt am Main: J. D. Sauerlander. 1846. 8vo. pp. xvi., 366.

7. *Fest-Reden für Israeliten, auf alle Feste des Jahres.* Von SALOMON PLESSNER. Berlin. 1841. 8vo. pp. xxvi., 421.

8. *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge über die Wochenabschnitte des Jahres.* Von J. N. MANNHEIMER. Wien: C. Gerold. 1835. 8vo. pp. xiv., 474.

9. *The Constancy of Israel, a Discourse delivered before the Congregation Shearit Israel, Charleston, S. C., on Shabat Parah Adar 18, 5610.* By Rev. M. J. RAPHAEL, A. M., Ph. D. 1850. 8vo. pp. 19.

10. *The Asmonean.* A Weekly Newspaper. New York.

VOL. LIV. — 4TH S. VOL. XIX. NO. I.

guess again more than once before the puzzle ends. We used to think that we understood the Jews, and could fix their character in a few off-hand sentences from the current opinion. We could call them a nation hardened, a perpetual sect stationary on principle and obstinate by persecution; their aversion to pork quite as conspicuous as their affection for gold; their trade old clothes; and their creed old parchments. We well remember when these notions were pretty severely rebuked, and we felt almost for the first time that the Jew is like the rest of us, a man of our common nature and our current time. It was in 1836, at the consecration of the first Synagogue in the Mississippi Valley and at Cincinnati. There sat Miriam and Rebecca in the gallery of the women, side by side with the Marys and Marthas of our own Church. There stood Benjamin and Ezra, and the like, in citizen's clothes, bearing the scrolls of the ancient law to the sanctuary; and chief of all spoke Joseph Jonas, the President, thanking their Christian friends for contributing to the edifice, and expressing great joy in setting up the ark of the One God of Israel in a country of unshackled religious liberty. As the sun went down, the singers began to chant the beautiful psalm of preparation for the Sabbath, and the Hebrew words in that new, bustling country seemed like the very voice of Memory singing of the light of other days in the fresh gardens of hope, and breathing something of its freshness into her song. The Jew is a man like ourselves, thought we, and what we had always held as an abstract principle regarding all races of men, now became fact regarding him, and we have looked upon him with other eyes since.

Our readers may smile at our ever needing such correction, and say that for a long time they have seen the working of the spirit of the age upon Judaism, and that the old superstition is going by the board before the storm of new ideas. We have been sometimes inclined to this view, and actually supposed that Jewish exclusiveness had received its death-blow from the very toleration of our times. We are not so sure of this as some ten years since, for with all the fresh life breathed by the age into the preaching and general thought of the Jews, there has been a strong tendency to revive the old standards of faith by the more orthodox party, and the reform

party are scarcely less zealous for the distinctive character of the nation, and the separation of the Synagogue from the Church. Whether disposed to call Judaism a hopeless petrification or a vanishing formalism, we must therefore guess again before the puzzle ends.

We propose to give such views of the subject as our recent reading and observation have afforded. From the difficulty of understanding the inner life and actual condition of familiar Christian sects around us, we must see the almost impossibility of a thorough appreciation of a people so peculiar in history and manners as the Jews. But we will do the best that considerable study and a desire to be candid will allow. Imperfect as this article may be, it will contain facts so new to us, that they may instruct a portion of our readers.

Begin by a glance at the history of the nation. Do we not see at once, that, notwithstanding their uniform adherence to the law of Moses, nothing can be more erroneous than to brand them as a set of exclusives, wholly cut off from the general life of mankind? Since the first captivity, they have shared in the intellectual progress of every nation among whom they have lived, and their creed, rigid as it has been in adherence to its fundamental idea, has passed through stages of development quite as marked as those which have attended the Christian religion. The Rabbinical system, we must believe, was developed during the Persian exile; and five centuries after Christ, not without marks of every intervening century upon its features, this system was finally consolidated into the Talmud. In the mysticism of the Cabala breathed the theosophic daring of the Alexandrian gnosis. Anan, founder of the Karaites, the Luther of the eighth century, caught his protest against the Rabbinical hierarchy from Motekallemin, the Arabic champion of reason against the Moslem orthodoxy, whilst the Jewish scholasticism of the Middle Ages runs nearly parallel with that of the Christian Church, and in Maimonides (1131-1234) and St. Thomas (1224-1274) each system completes its attempts to reconcile its faith with reason. The century that produced Descartes produced also Spinoza, and the latter confounded the decrees of the Rabbins even more than the former startled the repose of the priesthood. To come nearer our own

time, if Lessing led on the new liberalism of German Christianity, his friend and champion, Moses Mendelssohn, led the Jewish reform in education and letters which succeeded the most barren century in the Jewish annals (1660-1760).

We see, therefore, how largely Judaism has shared in the general progress of literature and philosophy, and the development of the Mosaic system in the Jewish Church has many traits in common with the development of the Gospel in the Christian Church. To compare the two, and run a parallel between the Rabbins and the Fathers, might be less flattering to the pride of Christendom than many suppose. When, indeed, we look into the interminable minutiae and crazy legends of the Talmud, we start back with aversion, and "St. Paul defend us!" rises at once to our lips, as we remember his conflict with such bondage, and his joy in Christian freedom is fresher to us than any commentary can make it. But when we take a fairer view, and compare the Talmud with its just counterpart, the acts and opinions of the Christian Fathers who governed the Œcumenical Councils, we change our tone; for no Rabbi is so wild that he may not be matched by some monkish Churchman. No superstition ever ruled the Sanhedrim more monstrous and pernicious than the denunciation of marriage and the glorification of celibacy, that are so conspicuous in the Church even of the fourth century. Taking a broad view of the Jewish and the Christian catholicism, we may trace the excesses of each to its leading idea; and the Rabbins have carried their notions of legal obedience quite as far as the priests have carried their notions of sacramental grace, and the Sanhedrim of Babylon has encumbered the Decalogue with a load of enactments very much like that which the Council of Trent has put upon the communion-table.

If Rabbi Ismael in the Talmud presumes to measure the stature of God, and to say that his height is 2,360,000,000 miles, and the distance from his right eye to the left is 3,000 miles, let us remember how much better it is to limit his form than to mutilate his attributes by creeds that claim vengeance on the innocent in place of the guilty, and doom little children unbaptized to an endless home in hell; creeds that showed

traces of themselves in the Church before the Talmudists had completed their labors and closed their canon.

The old Jewish sects may be very readily understood by tracing them to tendencies of our common nature, although the names have disappeared. The Pharisees were the party of tradition, the Romanists of their day, and undoubtedly were friends of progress before they undertook to check further development and consolidate their convictions into a rigid system. The Sadducees were sticklers for the letter of the law, opposed to tradition, not friendly to any progressive thought in religion, rejecting the doctrine of the resurrection, in politics highly conservative, and in most respects very much like that class of Protestants whose religion consists in a decent morality and a dogged secular conservatism. The Essenes were a set of ascetic spiritualists, more akin to the Pharisees than to the Sadducees, yet more prone to the mysticism embodied in the Cabala than to the ceremonials embodied by the Pharisees in the Talmud. These sects have disappeared, although their characteristics remain in various combinations. Much of the Sadducee lurks in the heart of the wealthy Jew, so comfortable under his modern privileges, and so jealous of all religious zeal, whilst the spirit of the Essene strongly leavens the meditative piety of the more contemplative devotees, and breaks out in the extravagances of the Chasidim or pietists. The Pharisee or orthodox party is still in the ascendant, and, with greater or less strictness, the sway of the ancient Rabbins is felt by both the old-school and the new-school Jews of our day.

In order to give a more just and candid view of the present condition of the Jews, we addressed a series of twelve large questions to the most distinguished of their ministers in this country, if not the most distinguished of their ministers who preaches in the English language, Rev. Dr. Raphall, of New York, and we now give his answer to the two most important of these questions, — one regarding their creed, the other regarding their sects: —

“1. All Jews believe, — 1st. There is one God, eternal, omnipotent, immaterial, and all-perfect; 2d. God has revealed his will by means of Moses his servant in the *Torah* (law) and by means of the prophets; 3d. God

rewards the good and punishes the bad, both in this life and in the next.

" These three essential principles are elucidated in the *Creed* (consisting of thirteen articles) composed by Maimonides, and which is received by *all* Jews.

" 2. There are not, properly speaking, any sects among the Jews. The ancient Sadducees have been extinct full 1,600 years, and since their extinction there have been no such differences on vital points of faith as that between Pharisees and Sadducees on the immortality of the soul; or as those between Unitarians and Trinitarians respecting the Godhead, — between Romanists and Protestants respecting the adoration of the " Mother of God," — between Calvinists and Arminians respecting predestination. Whereas the differences among the Jews are limited to the authority of tradition and of the observances founded thereon. The Karaites altogether reject tradition (as did the Sadducees of old), but in other respects hold the same belief as Rabbinical Jews. These Karaites are the followers of one Anan and his son Saul, who lived in Persia about the year 800 of the common era. They never were numerous, and do not now exceed a thousand families, who have their chief seat in the Crimea, while some few are found in Russian and Austrian Poland.

" With the exception of this small fraction, all Jews in every part of the world are Rabbinists, who accept the authority of tradition. The *old school* (as you designate it), or about nineteen twentieths of the whole nation, maintain that this authority is of divine origin, and that the chain of transmission is uninterrupted from Moses to the compilers of the Mishna; while the *new school* respect the tradition as representing the ancient usages of the Jewish people, and therefore to be upheld as far as practicable, and no further.

" This indeed is the great difference between the two schools. The one, in every observance resting on tradition, sees and respects a divine origin, while the other treats such observances as established by man, and therefore liable to be abolished. But observances commanded in the Torah (law of Moses), as Sabbath, circumcision, fasting on the Day of Atonement, abstaining from leaven on the Passover, &c., *all* Jews, Karaites as well as Rab-

binites, new school as well as old, equally consider binding.

“According to the Talmud, the Galileans were, long before the destruction of the temple by Titus, distinguished for their provincialism, and peculiar pronunciation, from the great body of the Jews. This difference of pronunciation has perpetuated itself, and to this day divides the Germano-Polish from the Portuguese and Italian Jews, a division strengthened by a difference in their ritual, caused chiefly by the introduction of numerous hymns (called *Piatim*) into the service of the Germano-Poles, which the Portuguese have not adopted. Hence the difference in *Minhag* usage which separates the Sphardim (Portuguese) and Ashkenazim (German) synagogues. But as both obey the same law, adopt the same creed, practise the same observances, recognize each other as orthodox, and join in prayer according to the ritual of either, they are not and cannot be considered as distinct sects.

“There are, especially in Germany, France, England, and these United States, many persons who call themselves and are recognized as Jews, but who live in open and habitual violation of the law of Moses. Many of them are members of and contributors to synagogues, and even attend public worship according to strict Rabbinical form, though they break the Sabbath and do not abstain from forbidden meats. But these individuals do not form any sect, they do not even attempt to defend their conduct, but confess that they do wrong and generally amend their ways as they become old.

“The new school (as you designate it), or the reformers, as they are generally called, are not numerous. They possess in Germany about six or eight synagogues, in England one, in the United States three, and in the West Indies one. In other countries none. East of the Vistula, and south of the Mediterranean, throughout Russia, Poland, Turkey, all Asia and Africa, where the immense majority of Jews are located, these reformers' principles are barely, if at all, known, and their views are adopted by no one. Their synagogues generally possess organs, the appearance of decorum is more strictly enforced, and their prayers are shorter, than in orthodox synagogues. Though among themselves these reformers are united by no uniform system, yet in their opin-

ions they all limit the authority of tradition, and in their observances reject the second days of Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles, which tradition has endowed with equal sanctity with the first days. The oldest of the reformed synagogues, or temples, as they are more generally called, is that of Hamburg, established in 1818; the oldest in the United States, that of Charleston, established about 1842.

"In Germany, the fatherland of every extreme opinion, there are some few Jews, chiefly professional men, educated at universities, who, while they maintain the unity of God, deny the authority of the *Torah*, or law of Moses, which they say was adapted to the wants and climate of Israelites in Jerusalem, but died a natural death before the advance of civilization and the requirements of the present age. These men are in fact Deists, but as the laws of Germany only recognize Christians and Jews, these men call themselves Jews because they are not Christians. Frequent attempts have been made by these disciples of Hegel to form themselves into a sect, to transfer the Sabbath to Sunday, to abolish circumcision, and with it all other ceremonial enactments and restrictions of the law. But they are so very few in number, and exercise so little influence on the public mind, that all their efforts repeated at Berlin, Frankfort, Königsberg, &c. have invariably proved abortive, as after a trial of one or at most two years their assemblies dwindle into nothing, and their synagogues have to be dissolved.

"*Les extremes se touchent.* More durable, influential, and extending is the association of Chasidim, *pious men*, in Lithuania, Galicia, and Southern Russia. These fanatics find not enough to occupy their imagination in the Talmud and Medrashim, they therefore have recourse to the obscurities and mysteries of Cabala, believe that it is possible to command spirits and to hold intercourse with the invisible world, and are firmly convinced that their chiefs and teachers by words and signs have power over the manifold classes of incorporeal beings with which they people "earth, sea, skies." Of all European Jews these Chasidim are the most superstitious and the least educated. Nor must we feel surprised at this, when we remember that the countries in which they and their ancestors for centuries have taken up their

residence are among the least civilized and most inaccessible in Europe. What wonder that Jews who reside amidst the rude Cossacks and barbarous Bulgarians should be superstitious and liable to be imposed on, when even in these United States, and amidst all the wonders of science, in the year of grace 1852, the far more clumsy imposture of 'rappings and mediums' is not too gross for the superstition of the credulous.

"The Samaritans claim to be Israelites, but their claim has never been allowed by the Jewish people. Their numbers have dwindled down to less than one hundred families, who chiefly reside at Nablous in Palestine. The ill-feeling between them and the genuine descendants of the patriarchs does not seem to have at all become moderated by time. Of course you are acquainted with the Samaritan text of the Pentateuch, and know that they possess no other portion of the Scriptures, except a spurious book of Joshua.

"No Samaritans or Karaites reside east of the river Vistula, though individual Karaite merchants sometimes visit the great marts of commerce, where, however, they join the synagogue. It is a remarkable fact, that whilst the number of Jews in every part of the world is increasing, both Samaritans and Karaites should be continually decreasing. The Samaritans in particular, without any visible external cause, seem to fall away in numbers."

We of course have the highest respect for Dr. Raphall's judgment, and do not question his statements. Yet we must put in a caution as to his classifying so large a majority under the head of Rabbinites. Men of the new school, like Salomon of Hamburg, and Stein of Frankfort, and Marks of London, do indeed render respect to the Talmud, but not as to authority, and they cannot be called in strictness Rabbinites, any more than most of us Protestants can be called Catholics; for whilst we respect in many points the decisions made by the ancient Church before the schism between the Eastern and Western branches, we cannot in any satisfactory sense be said to accept their authority. When the dissent, moreover, concerns doctrines so prominent as the literal coming of the Messiah and the return to Jerusalem, we must ascribe to the existing Jewish Church more of the elements of sectarianism than our learned

friend is disposed to do. We perceive, also, from German and English periodicals, that sectarianism goes sometimes so far as virtual non-intercourse between rival synagogues, and in one case, in London, we infer from an article in the *Jewish Chronicle*, that attendance upon a reform synagogue prevented the burial of a respectable Jew in consecrated ground under the charge of the more orthodox party. The new-school Rabbins speak of an extreme neological party, with whose views they have apparently as little sympathy as Liberal Christians have with Deists, or even Atheists. But we should judge, from what we read and observe, that these neologists are somewhat numerous in all the synagogues, and that the preaching of the ministers is a very inadequate test of the faith of the hearers. In this country, utter rationalism is to our personal knowledge a not uncommon thing with Jews, and the discourse of Dr. Raphall at Charleston, on the Constancy of Israel, contains arguments for the old faith that are called for by the laxity of far more of his nation than the latitudinarian of Albany, at whom he obviously aims.

We might take various paths of inquiry, and try to illustrate the chief aspects of Jewish thought and life in our time. But we find ourselves most attracted by the pulpit eloquence of the day, and we have before us ample materials for judging of the preaching in the synagogues. The books named at the head of this article have been freely consulted, and have value, although of different kinds. Dr. Schröder's compilation of the Talmudic doctrines and institutions is elaborate, without being discriminating, and serves up the accredited and discredited portions in pretty much the same style. The *Bibliotheca Judaica* is a work of vast research, and the two parts already published give a wholly new conception of the extent of Jewish authorship. The little historical sketch by Munk and Beer throws much light upon the philosophical character of Jewish thought, and lets us more into the intellectual traits of the nation than any thing we have yet met. It shows the various philosophical tendencies in the several ages, yet maintains that to the Jew philosophy has generally been a secondary consideration. The Treatises from the Mishna, or the text of the Talmud, are evidently translated with

great care and ample scholarship; yet they open to us a wilderness of supersublimated ceremonials, and seem to leave it in doubt how an honest man can get out of bed, or say his prayers, or eat his dinner, without crazing his head with Rabbinical casuistry. The four collections of sermons that follow in our list tell quite a different story, and open to us fields of fresh thought and beautiful diction. We have had many collections before us to choose from, but are content with selecting two of each kind, — Salomon and Stein of the new school, and Plessner and Mannheimer of the old school.

We believe it is not denied by the Jewish preachers, that the sermon, although in their view dating its existence far back in the Mosaic age, has taken its form from the Christian pulpit. For many centuries the voice of preaching seems hardly to have been heard in the synagogue, and ritual worship occupied the entire service. It is alleged, indeed, that the regeneration of the Jewish preacher's office preceded the regeneration of Christian preaching at the time of the Protestant Reformation, and that the Jewish preacher was silenced by legal enactment. But however this may be, it is obvious that pulpit eloquence in modern times has been a very recent thing in the synagogue, and the noted collections of sermons do not date back much beyond a quarter of a century. The new-school Jews appear certainly in theory to make far more account of the sermon than the old-school men, and Stein labors in his Preface to show how much Judaism has lost by sacrificing fresh utterance in the current language to a prolix ritual in the Hebrew tongue. Yet the orthodox party seem determined not to be outdone by the reformers, and in richness of Scriptural illustration, and curious learning and practical earnestness, we know no Jewish preacher superior to the out and out orthodox champion, Plessner of Berlin.

In style, the classic Jewish preachers have some common characteristics. Their discourses are characterized by a scrupulous symmetry in dividing the subject, an avoidance of all abstruse ideas, and even of controverted doctrines, a copiousness of simple and sensuous illustrations, an affectionate, hortatory tone of address, and a constant use of Scriptural images and phraseology. The

very titles of the sermons have often a happy savor of the Bible that mingles sacred with poetical associations; such as "The Path of Light"; "Abraham's Mirror"; "Life a Song"; "All for God"; "The Four Crowns of Life"; "How Great are Thy Works, O Lord!" In a sermon on the Feast of Tabernacles, Plessner takes his text from Leviticus xxiii. 40, and with much beauty, as well as ingenuity, uses the four kinds of trees ordered for the decoration of the tents to illustrate the four classes of men, those like the fragrant and tasteful Hada, who unite religious knowledge with good works, those like the fruitful but scentless palm, who have knowledge without works, those like the fragrant but tasteless myrtle, who have good works without knowledge, and those like the tasteless, scentless brook-willow, who have neither knowledge nor good works. The ingenious and somewhat far-fetched inference is, that as the branches of these trees were to be bound together to form the tents, so all four of these classes of men should be united to produce true reconciliation. We name this sermon chiefly to show how far the love of Scriptural illustration will sometimes carry the preacher into over-nicety of interpretation.

Looking beyond the style to the substance of the sermons, we must give them the praise of being generally very practical and earnest, enforcing the purest morality by devotional sentiment and divine sanctions. Doctrine of a controversial kind is scrupulously avoided. Nothing is said against other religions, and little is directly said in opposition to the rival party. We are left to infer who is of the old school, and who of the new, far less by specific statements of doctrine than by the fact that one class of preachers use the fresh thought of the time chiefly to revive interest in the ancient usages, whilst the other class use the old associations chiefly as symbols of the new life of humanity; or in the one case reason is used to legitimate authority, and in the other case authority is quoted to commend reason; whilst by both reason and authority are acknowledged. We perceive no such difference between the orthodox and liberal Jews as between Christians bearing those names. Mannheim's sermon on Man might, so far as its view of human nature is concerned, be written by Stein, and in respect to future punishment both classes seem content

with stating the fact, without insisting on its eternal duration. The new-school men, indeed, imply a somewhat milder view of human depravity, and a more positive hope of the final reconciliation of all men; yet they do not apparently aim to make these tendencies very conspicuous. They show, however, pretty clearly, that their hope for mankind does not depend upon the future coming of the Messiah or the return to Jerusalem, and in some cases are more bold in denying such anticipations than the other party are in asserting them.

The later volumes of sermons that we have read seem pervaded with the associations of the Jewish year, and the spirit which the Oxford school has breathed into the Christian calendar seems to have seized the orators of the Synagogue. There is much beauty in the fresh life which Maier and Salomon and Plessner and Mannheim have infused by special courses of sermons into the fasts and festivals of Judaism. Without losing a particle of our Christian allegiance, we too can keep with them the New Year with its cheerful hope, the Day of Atonement with its penitential prayers, the Feast of Tabernacles with its rural joy, the Passover with its jubilee of redemption, and the Feast of Pentecost with its commemoration of the Lawgiving. The use made of the sacred year by the liberal Jews proves to us what we have long believed, that Liberal Christians have made a great mistake in repudiating the ecclesiastical year of the Christian Church, instead of reclaiming it from bigotry and infusing into it the pure life and truth of the Gospel.

We should like to give some specimens of the pulpit eloquence of the Synagogue, but we must content ourselves with three or four selections, that we choose rather for their peculiarity of thought and style than for any especial brilliancy. The first is from Plessner's Sermon on the Chief Fact in the World's History, or the Mosaic Law as affecting the main interests of human life, the last of which, or the revelation of immortality, the author thus treats upon Old Testament grounds:—

“The last is the infinitely important interest of immortality, upon which the few particulars of the Lawgiving afford us clearer, more moving conceptions, than all the elaborate deductions with which philosophy has sought to demonstrate this subject, and yet never truly convinces and satisfies us upon it. Yes, I directly

maintain that this appearance dispensed with all further instruction upon immortality, and therefore the absence of an especial doctrine upon the subject in the Books of Moses, although indisputable traces of it may be found in substance in them, need not surprise us. What need of a lawgiver's teaching immortality, when he in the body passed forty days and as many nights with God, without requiring physical nutriment? Needed a lawgiver teach the existence of a spiritual world, when to him angels were naught and he yearned only for God's own presence? (Exod. xxxiii. 15.) Needed a people to be taught immortality who had expressly said: 'We have seen this day, that God doth talk with man and he liveth'? (Deut. v. 24.) And in fact the Law has brought us eternal life; even as we acknowledge the blessing, 'he gave us a true doctrine, and thereby planted eternal life in us.' Who can doubt of immortality, who already has it in the life of the body and sees every wish fulfilled: 'Thy future world shouldst thou see even in thy life'? (Berach. 16, b.) 'That whole age,' it is said, (Pirk. R. Elies. 46,) 'which heard the voice of God on Sinai, had the felicity to be equal to the angels. . . . Joy to them in this, joy to them in the future life.' Therefore the history of this day's festival sets forth the exalted interest of immortality in a manner grand, unexampled, and transcending infinitely all the grounds of reason."

We do not vouch for the orator's logic, but only aim to give a specimen of his mode of treating great subjects. It is clear to us that the Jewish preachers take all the moral and spiritual ideas of our Christian culture and refer them to the old dispensation. Gleams, indeed, of all religious truth appear in the Hebrew Scriptures, but we do not believe that the Jew, by the aid of the Old Testament alone, much less of the Books of Moses only, could have so illustrated the higher virtues of forgiveness and spirituality and the exalted truths of the soul's immortal destiny. We find in these volumes many New Testament sermons from Old Testament texts, and we like the transfer much better than the reverse habit, so common among some Christians, of preaching the darkest of Old Testament notions from New Testament texts, and exhibiting the Heavenly Father under the most awful imagery with which the Hebrew imagination clothed their God of Battles.

Stein of Frankfort seems in his preaching to have a more direct eye to the signs of the times than his compeers, and we translate a short passage, that at once

shows his view of the relation of his nation to the age, and the Orientalism of his style. It is from the last sermon in his volume. He is urging his people not to lose their identity in the commotions of the age, and thus mistake the mission of Judaism.

“Such is the destiny of Israel, and such its relation to other religious associations. By a parable let us make the point more clear. There was once a king who had several sons. He sent the younger of them to war, to conquer for him the world; but he kept his eldest at home, intrusted to him the defence of the capital, the charge of the palace, and the protection of his goods. The other sons, who had won renown in foreign lands, soon looked proudly down upon their brother; they had done so much, he so little. This grieved the poor man; but the father comforted him and said: ‘Only wait, and they will soon learn to prize you.’ And in the course of years many of the brothers fell upon the bloody field, but the others, when exhausted they laid aside the sword, how glad were they in returning home to find the father’s house so well protected and ordered, and how they thanked the brother for his quiet, peaceful administration! Who has not at once recognized God in the royal father, other religious bodies in the brothers, Israel in the eldest son! They have a call to win distant nations to a purer worship of God, yet Israel has not the mission to *conquer*, but to *guard* faithfully the father’s house and property, and the Israelite may even unto death rejoice ever in the faith in the One and Only, for so long as he has kept this confession truly, he has not lived in vain.”

We translate from Mannheimer’s Sermon on the Sign in Heaven, or the Bow of Promise, a short passage on the appeal of nature to the soul:—

“Do we turn back to history, the same doctrine presents itself! When the earth in all its arrangements was finished, and that Paradise stood forth in all its beauty, then man was sent to keep it and till it.

“But when, instead of keeping it and guarding it against all pollution, he yielded himself to the rude and savage law of nature, and, instead of obeying the spirit, submitted to the power of the flesh,—then broke forth the floods which swept him away and destroyed all which men had builded for sixteen hundred years, even to the last vestige. One only remained, and on account of his pious sense and his upright conduct he was saved by the strong hand of God.

“The signs in heaven should remind you of this. And thus history coincides with what nature makes visible to you. Both are one and the same revelation of God.

"As long as you have the sacred feeling of innocence in your hearts, and are in a state to hear and accept the voices of truth and right, so long you obey their laws and bring an offering to your God from a pure heart; so long you stand under the watch and guidance of God, like the stars in heaven, you go and come at his bidding like they, you will set and rise, — in one quarter set and in another rise and shine upon all who live near you.

"Do you find in your hearts, in your souls, on your hands, a spot and a stain? O, 'look up to the heavens'! Even they are not pure and without clouds. But the clouds come and go, and then heaven shines out in its full splendor, in its first-born purity, clearness, and joy. For what else should be storms, — the storms in nature, the storms in the life of man?

"Hear you the storms which God sends, the voices, the thunder-voices of the Lord; and when floods and waters come upon you in life — look up to heaven! When the fearful hours are past, the signs of the Lord will appear to you like messengers of peace, and as your eyes are closed, your heart will be warmed thereby. The peace of God will return to your breast, as he brings calmness and rest to troubled nature, that every thing which has breath may praise the Lord. He is in the storm and in the lightning, even as in the gentle moving of the air and in the sunbeams which color the clouds, he has his messengers, who there perform his will. Amen."

Salomon of Hamburg is head of the new school, and we would quote gladly many passages from his earnest, manly, and affectionate sermons. We can give, however, but a single extract, and this from a volume more recent than the English version named in our list. It is from a collection of Festival Sermons by him and Maier, published at Stuttgart in 1840. It is the close of a discourse at the Feast of Tabernacles, "On the Art of being Happy," and is a fair specimen of the practical spirit of the preacher in what we should call a good, hearty Thanksgiving sermon.

"The fourth and last essential of true happiness now remains: *noble works for eternity*. I will name at once these noble works, that is, kindness and beneficence. Can you feel happy, if you behold sorrow and mourning, want and misery, around you? Can thine eye smile pleasantly, if thy brother's eye swims in tears? Canst thou enjoy abundance of goods, if thou canst read in the countenance of hundreds that they are starving, and have no clothing for the naked body and no shelter for the weary head? Canst thou heartily rejoice in thy children, whilst thou seest desolate orphans wandering about? Can men, can Israel-

ites, be happy so? When Job looked back to his early prosperous days he said: 'When the ear heard me, then it blessed me; and when the eye saw me, then it gave witness of me; because I delivered the poor that cried, and the fatherless, and him that had none to help him. The blessing of him that was ready to perish came upon me; and I caused the widow's heart to sing for joy. I was eyes to the blind, and feet was I to the lame.' Job knew that to be happy was to make others happy!

"And to this the feast which we this day celebrate calls us without ceasing. Of no other feast does the wise man so often repeat the words: 'Thou shalt rejoice in thy food, thou, and thy son, and thy daughter, and thy man-servant and maid-servant, and the Levite, the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow.' Would you, rich and prosperous, feel happy, after thine harvest is secure, remember the Levite who has no inheritance in Israel; remember the servant whose whole property is in his master's good-will; and remember the widow, unhappy one, who has lost her all with her husband; remember the orphan, who with the love of father and mother was deprived of the greatest goods of life. Stretch far thine own paradise, bid to the feast and close not the doors, if you would enjoy paradise yourself. You beautify the earth and inherit heaven, when kindness and beneficence are works done for eternity.

"To sum up all: —

'A pure heart, from guilt set free,
A united house, to God devoted,
Force with force, deed with deed combined,
Noble works for immortality.'

"Amen!"

The four extracts that we have translated give a pretty good idea of the spirit of the modern Jewish pulpit. Compared with the current tone of Christian preaching, it need not hide its head in respect to good sense, freedom, earnestness, and elegance. We miss, indeed, in the Synagogue much of the searching evangelical point that lays bare the central sinfulness of the heart, and calls the penitent to make his peace with God. We of course miss the blessed ministry of our Saviour, as giving life to every spiritual truth by his example, and as counselling heaven and earth by his unceasing work of reconciliation. Moses with the tables of stone is not enough for the heart, and it is precisely when the Jewish preacher touches most closely upon the spiritual life, that we most feel the need of Christ; and it is the best of these sermons, by their aspiration, and not the worst, by their formalism,

that lead us most tenderly to the cross of Jesus as the true and living way.

We need only add, in speaking of the Jewish pulpit, that we have heard one of the best of its preachers, and that Dr. Raphall, in his clear, glowing, extemporaneous manner, deserves name among the conspicuous pulpit orators of our day. We have sometimes thought, in listening to him after some of the dry dogmatists nearer ourselves, that the Church and Synagogue had exchanged teachers, as the chemist's cups sometimes exchange fluids, and the Christian had appropriated the Law and the Jew the Gospel. Yet even such an experience could not suppress our yearning that, where the spirit of Christianity is so warmly recognized, the great fact, the sacred person in whom that spirit was made flesh, might be also recognized, and the Gospel thus be presented in its divine life.

We close this article with some remarks upon the present prospects of the Jews, as indicated by their statistics, their social and moral condition, and their religious tendencies.

Germany, Prussia, Austria, Denmark, Sweden, and Poland have authentic statistics of Jews in their dominions, but not so other lands. We have seen the entire number in the world estimated variously at from three to eight millions. The London Times estimates it at five millions, but the most approved Jewish authorities at seven millions. In the United States it is impossible to form an exact estimate of their number, as every week brings fresh accessions. There are, besides, we are assured, hundreds of them scattered through the Southern and Western States, who are not known as such for years, but who eventually come forward and confess their faith. We are informed by a prominent Rabbi of New York city, that, from the quantity of flour consumed for Passover cakes, the number of Jews in the city and State had more than doubled during the seven years from 1845 to 1851. At present he estimates the Jews in that city at not less than twenty-five thousand, with seventeen synagogues and places of worship. In Philadelphia there are about eight thousand, with five synagogues; in Baltimore, five thousand, with three synagogues; in Cincinnati, five thousand, with four syna-

gogues; in New Orleans, about two thousand, with two synagogues. In addition to these large numbers, there are Jews and Jewish congregations in almost every considerable town throughout the Union. In Charleston, Richmond, New York, Philadelphia, and New Orleans, there are Portuguese synagogues; all the others adhere to the German or Polish *Minhag*, or usage. The whole number of Jews throughout the States cannot be less than two hundred thousand, and increases constantly.

As to their moral condition, we have found the most contradictory accounts. Schroeder multiplies stories of their gross stupidity, indolence, and superstition, in Northern Europe, especially in Russia; whilst he makes those in North Africa, especially Algiers, to be infamously degraded, even to supplying brothels with their daughters; and we have the authority of Rev. D. W. Marks, of London, a prominent new-school preacher, for the statement, that the Israelites of Egypt and Syria set at naught the decrees of Rabenu Gershon and the Hundred Rabbins, without being considered at all schismatic by the rest of Israel. Mr. Mayhew, the author of *London Labor and the London Poor*, states, that very many of the lower sort of Jews, especially those engaged in street traffic, rarely go to the synagogues on the Sabbath, but spend most of the day in their favorite pursuit of gambling for small stakes. He also states, that the synagogues are not well attended, and that there is a buzzing talk among the attendants during the ceremony, and an absence of seriousness and attention. We requested the Rabbi already quoted to give his opinion as to the actual attachment of his race to their faith, and the symptoms of any general decline, and he writes as follows:—

“When we speak of Jews, we must divide them into two large bodies,—the Eastern and Western,—the river Vistula and the northern shores of the Mediterranean forming the line of demarcation. The Eastern, comprising above five sevenths of the entire people, have never experienced any diminution of zeal, but are, at this day, as strict in their observances, and as ready for martyrdom, as their ancestors have been at any time since the dispersion. Among the Westerns, zeal is not so ardent, and among them those departures from orthodoxy and

open violations of the Law are found of which I have spoken. Nevertheless, among them, likewise, there is a strong attachment to the faith of their fathers, and devotion to their observances; and I feel convinced that, if it were necessary, — even among the Jews of the United States, who are the least zealous I know, — full three fourths of the entire number of Western Jews would emulate the worthies of the Spanish peninsula, who, in 1492, sacrificed native land, property, and social position to their religion. As to absorption by *any other* religious system, of that there is not the least danger. Indeed, if there be any truth in prophecy, it cannot come to pass.

“The converts from Judaism do not form either a considerable or a respectable class. I should suppose that by far the greater number consider their change of faith as a trading speculation; and therefore prefer Trinitarianism to Unitarianism. In some few instances, respectable Jews — who from habit and education had become estranged from the observances of their own faith, but who find it necessary to train their children according to some system of religion — embrace Christianity; these men probably prefer Unitarianism. There may also, now and then, be cases of Jewish converts, whose ardent imagination and love of the mysterious may lead them to embrace the Trinity. But it remains a singular and suspicious circumstance, that, in Europe at least, Jewish converts always join the church dominant. Returns to Judaism, especially when the converts become old, are frequent.”

There have been various movements towards bringing the Jews into some general association, and last year we observed a call to that effect, by a correspondent, in the *Univers Israelite*, of Paris. But since the patriarchal dignity of the descendants of Hillel, at Tiberias, became extinct (about A. D. 400), and since the Princes of the Captivity, in Sura (Persia), ceased their rule (about 1040), there has been no central Rabbinical authority. Napoleon tried in vain to revive the Grand Sanhedrin; and some countries, like Germany and Denmark, require the Jews to elect a Chief Rabbi for the whole land, and sub-Rabbins in each district. In France, the general administration of Jewish affairs is in the hands of the Consistoire Central, which has its seat in Paris, and is composed of clerical and lay members, the senior of the former being Grand Rabbi of all France. Under this central authority there are several consistories, each with its Grand Rabbi. In Great Britain, the Jews of Ger-

man and Polish lineage and ritual voluntarily place at their head a Chief Rabbi, whose authority is acknowledged throughout the British empire, in every part of the world; whilst the Jews of the Portuguese and African lineage and ritual who reside in London form an independent community. But, generally, the highest authority in spiritual matters recognized by each congregation of Israelites, is that of its own Rabbi. In the United States the synagogues are entirely upon the congregational platform, in matters spiritual and temporal; and the Rabbi, when consulted upon cases of conscience, applies the Scriptural or the oral law to each case, according to his best judgment. We see no signs in either hemisphere of the revival of a central Rabbinical authority.

We will not invade the British Chancellor Disraeli's favorite domain, and try to celebrate the services of the Jews to art and literature. It is evident, however, that they have great influence over the press and the fine arts in Europe, and that the many periodicals bearing a Jewish name are the least part of their work. We know of five theological periodicals expressly devoted to Judaism in Germany, two in France, one in England, two in the United States, one each, at least, in Holland, Russia, and Italy, not to mention older reviews now extinct, the most valuable of which is the *Hebrew Review*, (London, 1840-41,) which introduced for the first time to the English language the richest treasures of Jewish learning and philosophy.

Regarding the prospects of the Jewish race on the whole, we have no prophecy to utter; for if the future of every nation and religion so often defies conjecture, what shall we say of the nation and religion so exempt from the general fate of mutability? It is clear to us, that Judaism is undergoing, through the general illumination and tolerance of our time, an ordeal more perilous than any age of persecution; and Christian sunshine may win many to lay aside phylacteries that would have been clasped even to death against the old blasts of hatred. It is clear, that there is an extreme party of utter unbelievers, — Hegelians of the left and others, — yet we incline to think that these become less rather than more under the influence of the milder type of religion exhibited by the new school, and virtually adopted by the old

school in many cases. The liberal philosophy of Mendelssohn is favored by leaders of the orthodox party, and the disposition to claim him as an orthodox Jew warrants the opinion, that the Jewish leaders are not willing to set faith into a quarrel with the light and liberty of the age. They are as strenuous as ever for their distinctive law and ritual; yet make a boast of their liberality, and even claim for Judaism a spirit of toleration* throughout all its history. The promise seems to be, that the Jews generally will keep to their national caste, and even the thorough-going neologists observe the distinctive rite of circumcision; whilst the life that is breathing itself into every sect and society of the world is not unmindful of them, and is moving them, perhaps unconsciously, to some significant part in the future of civilization.

We do not see any way for them, as a people, to go over to Christian orthodoxy, for the doctrine of vicarious sacrifice, as accepted by Calvinistic orthodoxy in its creed, and the doctrine of the incarnate Godhead, so materialized by prelatial orthodoxy in its sacraments, are utterly at variance with the first principles of their faith. Such nominally orthodox converts as Neander show how hard it is for a Jew to accept either of those doctrines in its literal meaning, and how essentially Unitarian their modes of thought must be. We have known many Jews to be baptized into the faith of Unitarian Christians, yet we see no signs of any general movement of this kind. They appear destined to an indefinite future, as a distinct people, whatever incidental changes may happen to them. Circumstances may occur, that shall give them possession of Palestine; yet such an event would probably attract but a small minority thither from their free and thrifty homes in more favored countries. They may pass through a more directly personal and social regeneration, and the Synagogue may emulate the Church in piety and charity. Certainly, if they are true to what is best in their system, they cannot fail to be of service to a restless and materialistic age, by their constant witness of God's unity and spirituality, and the authority of that Law which is the security of civil order and domestic

* *Beleuchtung des Alten Judenthums.* Von Aaron Günzburg. Prag. 1846. pp. viii., 84.

purity, as well as of religious reverence. If, as a philosophic Jew has in substance said, Heathenism tends to lose God in nature, and popular Christianity tends to lose God in humanity, and so both may lead to Pantheism, a pure faith is needed, which shall present God to men as their moral governor, apart from theosophic speculations, which shall overthrow the new idolatry, and restore the throne of God to worship in love and reverence. This, says the philosopher,* is the problem of Judaism, and therein lies its future! We say, rather, this is the problem of mankind, and the Jew may help the Christian in its solution, if true to his best light.

S. O.

ART. II.—SHALL WE INTRODUCE SOME LITURGICAL
OR RITUAL FORMS IN OUR PUBLIC WORSHIP?

AMONG the topics discussed at the Unitarian Convention held in Baltimore in October last, was that of the expediency of introducing some liturgical forms into our public worship. The subject was not formally presented by the Business Committee, nor was any great stress laid upon it as a matter of pressing interest, or as one which promised either to be heartily entertained by our congregations, or to be of much service, by itself alone, in deepening the religious effect of our services. The subject came up incidentally, as a part of a larger and more complicated theme, for which we can find no better designation than to call it *Church Life*, or the promotion of an intelligent and vigorous spirit of Christian culture in our congregations. Our brethren who were not at the Convention, and the laity of our denomination in general, would be strangely mistaken, as well as needlessly alarmed, if they were to suppose that any proposition was entertained or advocated at Baltimore, which looked to the introduction of a ritual service through a book, defining, after the mode of the Book of Common Prayer, the Prayers, Psalms, and portions of Scripture to be read by the minister, according as they were appointed for the Sundays of the year. We may safely affirm, that no such proposition would find an advocate among our ministers. Whatever may be the defects or short-comings of the Congrega-

* Dr. Beer, *Philosophie und Philosophische Schriftsteller der Juden*. Anmerkungen, pp. 92, 93.

tional mode of worship, the occasional experience which most of us have had of a liturgical service does not dispose us to seek relief in that direction. If the whole question at issue were to be tried by a comparison, for instance, between the service in the Prayer Book for the Burial of the Dead, which is so often, and, as we think, so unduly and extravagantly extolled, and the extemporaneous utterances which are in use with us, we could not for one moment hesitate as to which of the two methods to prefer. Nor would we allow that prejudice or custom had biassed our minds, for we should be prepared to give intelligent reasons for our conviction. In about one case out of each ten where we have officiated at funerals, we should have been satisfied with the form in the Prayer Book. But to be confined to that form in all cases would be a painful, often a most embarrassing experience, and would cramp or destroy those sensibilities, the full, free exercise of which alone can make such a service sincere to us. The Scriptural portions of that form are, of course, free to the use of all who may officiate at a funeral, and there is no good reason why any one should be confined to them. But the objection in our mind and feelings to any set form on such occasions is, that we cannot in all cases use even the same expressions of prayer to God, or apply, by implication, the same suggestions, views, and consolations to the attendants at a funeral. Common as is the experience of death, every instance in which it addresses us has its own peculiar aspect, appeal, admonition, counsel, or lesson of sadness or hope. We would be free to yield to the varying emotions thus excited, to the different utterances thus prompted. We cannot express our religious feelings in the same words over the infant of a day, and over the mother who dies in giving it birth; over the remains of one who has wasted life in a reckless, vicious course, and over some sainted disciple, whose days have been spent in all Christian fidelity to love and duty; over the aged frame, bowed by fourscore years, and ripened for the garner, and over the young man or maiden sinking mysteriously into death from the very glow of life. If there are reasons why any religious services should be held over the dead, those reasons enjoin that the services should be adapted to the lesson which death has consecrated in every case, either through the life of the departed, or through the circumstances of its close, or through the relations and condition of survivors. We feel very differently in the sight of death when it has come by some instant shock, such as a disaster, or a blow, and when it relieves some patient sufferer who has waited for it through months or years of decline. Experience has proved to us that much of the unction, the sincerity, the solemnity, and the power of consolation in a funeral service, depends upon the adaptation to each case of fitting sentiments and

words. We are well aware, that much may be said in reply as to the offences against good taste, the infelicities of speech, the jarring or lacerating effects of ill-chosen expressions or objectionable personalities, as well as to the risk of insincerity, to which our mode of conducting funeral services may be liable. But we do not admit that these objections are of force to withstand the grounds of our preference. They concern the imperfections of the men who officiate, not attaching necessarily to the mode of service.

If, however, the issue be raised afresh between a formal and a free service in our churches, taking the issue in its whole length and breadth, we confess that we are so thoroughly persuaded of the superiority of our own method, that we should not care to entertain the question in our pages as if it were an open one. A liturgical service involves two conditions: first, what is called a Christian calendar of the year, and second, an allotment or appointment of particular prayers and selections from Scripture for the Sundays, and for all other occasions of public worship. Both these conditions involve arbitrary and fictitious, or at least fanciful and supposititious devices. There are not enough distinct incidents in Christian history to mark with a specific title and consecration each Sunday in the year, and there are no reasons why such an arbitrary allotment should be made. If any person by the exercise of his ingenuity should be able to designate fifty-two great incidents in the evangelical history, another person with no more ingenuity might designate sixty or seventy such incidents, equally worthy to give a title to some Sunday in the year. In the mean while, a preacher is free to use the few great incidents of the Saviour's life on the earth, his birth, his crucifixion, his manifestation to the Gentiles, his resurrection, and his ascension, with the Pentecostal day of the Apostolic Church, as occasions for peculiar recognition in his Sunday services. And if the preacher chooses, he can annually adapt his utterances to the sentiment which consecrated the festival of All-Saints, or that of All-Souls, or any other observance which has about it the aroma of Christian piety and hope. But shall not the preacher be free to Christianize the great year of Providence, with its Sundays of spring-time, summer, harvest, and winter, with all their sweet and precious influences? Shall not the bursting bud, and the full foliage, and the fading leaf, and the crowded garner, the days of brightness and the days of gloom, the summer sun and the wintry storm, and all the passing and changing aspects of the seasons, fill his heart with answering sentiments, finding expression in words of discourse and prayer? What meaning is there in the "Tenth Sunday after Trinity," compared with the meaning of a Sunday when, just after the loss of a hundred human lives

in a burning ship, or the death of the greatest man in a nation, friends and neighbors enter the place of worship, and wait for the prayer or the lesson which shall meet the emotions of their hearts?

But we did not intend to discuss the question, into which we have already advanced beyond our purpose. As has been already observed, no proposition was made at Baltimore for the introduction of what might properly be called a liturgical service in our worship. Something far short of that was suggested, which might avail towards a closer engagement of the personal interest of the members of the congregation, especially of young persons, in the religious services of the church. A responsive use of some of the Psalms, or of some other portions of the Bible, an audible repetition of the Lord's Prayer, or of some other brief form of devotion, in connection with our present extempore exercises, was the utmost that was advocated by any speaker. So that the question which now engages the minds of some of our brethren, is not that of a Liturgy, strictly speaking, but of an intermingling of the voices of the congregation with that of the minister in a part of the Sunday services, together with some arrangement of passages from the Scriptures, with some ancient anthems and prayers, in such a way as may enlist and fix the devout attention of the worshippers.

The Rev. Dr. Dewey of Washington had intended to express his views at some length on this point, but circumstances prevented his giving utterance to them in full in the remarks which he made before the Convention. At our request, he has put into our hands a more extended statement of his opinions on the subject. For convenience' sake we offer them to our readers in the form of a speech, according to which the author wrote them out.

EDS.

MR. MODERATOR, — The Business Committee has proposed, as one of the subjects thought fit to occupy the attention of the Convention, that of Church Life and Usages; and under this head, I wish to say something of *the use of forms of prayer*. As all that lies in us to do, as a Convention, is simply to *consider* what will best promote the great interests of religion, and as worship stands at the *head* of all religious means, the subject seems to me alike important and unobjectionable. We have neither the power nor the wish to impose any observances upon those with whom we are connected, whether churches or individuals. We do not meet here for any such purpose. We do not meet even for busi-

ness. We meet simply to *deliberate* upon the common religious welfare; to consider what will advance it; to help one another to form juster opinions and to take deeper views upon this momentous interest.

Worship, I say, is the highest means to the highest end. Whatever, therefore, helps worship, is of the highest importance. Now, I am far enough from proposing to supersede spontaneous worship, — worship without book or ritual. But I am persuaded that, if a good ritual of domestic and public devotion could be introduced into all our families and churches, it would be an immense aid to our religious culture.

It would open an easy way to family devotion. It has already done so in many cases. It relieves the diffidence which many heads of families feel about such an undertaking. Young persons — females — can read prayers; many do so; while original prayer it would be beyond them to attempt. Even to repeat devoutly the simple utterances of David, — those that are of universal application, which alone should be in a psalter, — would be offering prayers and praises. They form, indeed, the noblest Liturgy in the world.

With regard to the public service, it is true that any change in the mode of worship (if change there shall be) must probably, in most cases, be very gradual. If a Liturgy were put into our hands that entirely satisfied us, and if any pastor of a church and half the people were inclined to use it, still, in a matter of such holy delicacy to men's minds and consciences, nothing could be done rashly or hastily. The usage must be *tried*, step by step. Thus some of the prayers might be occasionally used by the pastor, for his own relief; this probably would not be objected to. Then the Psalter, i. e. a selection from the Psalms, might be read, instead of the whole book, — which has much in it whose pertinence is circumstantial, and has passed away. Then, perhaps, responses might be introduced. And, withal, it appears to me, that there should always be a place in the service for spontaneous prayer.

But all this is far in advance of what concerns us at present. We are now to consider the question of Liturgies, as if it were quite an abstract question; but not, — surely not as a question of idle ceremony. There can

be no interest so vital, so profound, so all-comprehending, as worship.

Why should I speak of it in this way? — for you all know it. And yet, so has this ever-living interest hardened into an ordinance and a custom, that I can never speak of it without wishing to go down to the grounds of it in my own mind, — without saying why I worship, or rather, why I cannot help it. And in saying this, I shall also say why I think that this worship is not ordered with sufficient care in many of our Protestant churches.

God who made the world, — He it is that we worship. We believe that He made the world, — that He made *us*, — that He sustains, enfolds, our being, and is more intimately near to it than any other, — that He kindled up this light within us, and *all* the light and love and beauty that shine around us. Thus, then, I reason. If it is right to admire whatever is worthy of admiration, to admire intelligent power and beneficence, — if it is right to love what is lovely, to revere what is venerable, — then it is clear that all these sentiments should rise in supreme homage to that Being, in whom dwell the perfection, the fulness, the infinitude of all these attributes. Even if it were held, as some have held, that God has already given us all that is needful, whether temporal or spiritual, and that it is impertinent or irreverent to ask for more, yet even then, and none the less, would expressions of gratitude and veneration be due and fit. From all worlds, from all intelligent creatures, they would be due. The simple reason of things would require them. The grandest and fittest acts that a creature can perform would be wanting, if worship had no place in his life. The brightest spot, the very shekinah of his being, would be darkened, if no altar-fire were kindled. To a rational and reverent soul, the earth would be dead, and the heavens would cover it as a pall, if no light from above streamed down, and there were no reflection, no return of that light from beneath.

But we believe, too, in prayer, — not only in homage, but in prayer. We believe that the instinctive and irrepressible cry of our human necessity may be heard and answered; and answered by more than the simple effect of prayer upon our own minds, which is no answer, which is a falsity in the very statement. I cannot pray simply

because it makes me feel pious. I can *meditate* for that reason; I *could* worship for that reason, though I had rather not,—there is an infinite Glory for me to worship, and that is all that I wish to think of; but I cannot pray, simply that I may pray myself into devotion. Such a praying-machine,—they *have* such, we are told, in Thibet and Tartary,—such a self-mesmerizing word-mummer, I cannot be. And I have no difficulty, but the difficulty created by my childish weakness and ignorance, on account of the infinite number and variety of the petitions offered. If an earthly governor can attend to a thousand supplicants, surely the Infinite Mind can hear and answer millions,—millions, unnumbered and innumerable.

But such being the nature and grounds of worship,—such being the grand reason and fitness of it,—it being, indeed, the chief, the supreme interest of the world, that this tie be kept strong and indissoluble, of creatures to the Infinite Creator, of children to the Infinite Father,—the question arises, and it rises to the highest importance, What are the best modes and aids of this worship? and I mean now, of course, of social and public worship.

Let me say then, in general, that the medium, the organ of this communication between earth and heaven, should be one of the greatest possible dignity, and fitness to the service. It should offer to our worship the greatest aid and the least impediment that the case admits. In worship, we require repose, assurance, and the freest and most unimpeded flow of our feelings. If we are obliged, in prayer, to doubt about the words or the ideas that are uttered,—if we are led to question this thought, or to criticize that phrase,—and something of this, perhaps, is inevitable, when we do not *know* what is to be said or uttered,—all this must operate as a hindrance to our devotion.

Now all this, it is obvious, is in favor of fixed forms of prayer,—of a Liturgy. It is commonly *admitted* that the number of persons is extremely small to whom we can resign our minds to be led in this service, without doubt or question. Would it not be nearer the truth to say, that it is almost impossible that we should, in such a case, surrender ourselves unreservedly to any man? It may be suggested, indeed, that neither may

the printed form satisfy. But in this case, at least, we *know* what is put down; if we have reserves (which is unlikely), we have determined upon them beforehand; we have no doubts or uncertainties to disturb us.

But beside the repose and assurance which a Liturgy gives us, there is in it a character of impersonality, of universality, and common consent, which imparts to it great weight, dignity, and authority. With an action so sublime and venerable as worship, every thing should be in keeping and harmony. Individual peculiarities seem to be out of place in such a service. Every thing that savors of personal eccentricity, or that reveals personal embarrassment, all halting or hesitating speech, every unusual or unfit word or phrase, peculiarly grates upon the mind when engaged in solemn prayer. A modest man must often shrink from undertaking to lead the devotions of others. "Who is sufficient for these things?" The anxieties of most preachers, I believe, gather especially around this part of their public duty. It is a fearful thing for me, a weak and erring man, exposed to various moods, and beset with imperfections of thought and speech, to stand up, in my own personality, to be the organ of a whole people's solemn approach to their Maker. But with a prescribed form of prayer, it is not I alone, it is the whole people, that prays. With the words accepted and agreed upon beforehand, sanctioned by the common consent, — with the book in their hands and under their eye, — I believe that the people are more likely to make the prayer their own, than any individual and comparatively isolated prayer that the minister may offer. The minister drops out of sight; the book, the prayer, occupies attention more. The prayer proceeds more independently of the minister. It is impersonal, I repeat; it is the Church praying. It has the dignity and authority of deliberative consent. It is charged with the burden of abiding respect and usage. It is the usage of past times. It is the usage of all places. The heart sinks into it unquestioning. A Liturgy, unbosoming, as it should, the records and relics of good men's thoughts of the olden time, gives us their venerable aid, and is sanctified by their experience. The litanies of ages thus breathe their incense through our worship, — through the perpetual worship of the Church.

I am sensible, that an argument never gains any thing, but rather loses much, by extravagant statements. For a better than any politic reason, I desire never to make such statements. I know that there is devout and humble prayer under all forms, in all our churches, and I do not deny that in oral or spontaneous prayer there are some advantages.

One of them appears to me so great, that I would not, by any means, for my part, exclude spontaneous devotion from the public service. I would give a place to both kinds of prayer. The advantage I speak of is this: *the mind of the preacher is likely to be more thoroughly engaged in the whole service*, when a part of it is to be his own prayer. It is easy to see how this difference may naturally arise from the circumstances. If the preacher goes to the service, feeling that the devotional part is all prepared for him, he is liable passively to lean upon it; he may not feel the need of any special preparation of mind and heart for it. But if, on the contrary, he is to offer his own prayer, he is naturally led to meditate more deeply, — to stir up the gift that is within him; and thus his preaching is likely to be more earnest for his praying. So true is this, that I think it is settled into a maxim in many of our religious conventions, that, although clergymen are present who could perform the service, and relieve the preacher, yet it is better that he who is to preach should also pray. Indeed, the true preaching is a great act of worshipping, — a great feeling of the things of religion; and praying best prepares for that. For many years, I have carefully observed, both at home and abroad, the effect of liturgical and spontaneous devotion upon the preaching and the whole service. For a long time I was disposed to advocate a Liturgy as the sole usage; but I have come to see the matter in another light; and now my conclusion is clear and fixed, that I would, *by all means*, retain the element of spontaneous prayer in every service. If I may venture to speak so plainly, while I speak respectfully, I would say, that it is the neglect of spontaneous prayer in the English Church that accounts for what seems to me the singular want of earnest preaching in it. It is not, in my opinion, merely that the service of prayer in that Church is excellent or is long; that it usurps atten-

tion, or overlays the rest of the service; but that the inward preparation for the preacher's public duty is likely to be different.

I would have one prayer, therefore, in the public service, voluntary; and the place for it should be immediately before the sermon. Let the great liturgic service for all the people be gone through; but when the preacher is about to address them, let him lift up his heart and their hearts to God. This, too, would give him an opportunity to notice such *circumstances* as cannot be recognized in a permanent form. But let him especially pour out his heart in petitions for the Divine blessing. It is, indeed, a distinct usage in the English and Roman Churches,—in the English before the sermon, and in the Roman after the introduction. Let it not, however, be merely a few words of formal invocation; but a fuller utterance, which, though not long, shall be as full and free as seems good to the preacher.

Meanwhile, with this arrangement, the main advantages of a Liturgy are preserved; and they are great. In speaking of them I have not been delivering any abstract argument; it is my own experience. I once felt, in common, I suppose, with many of us, strong prejudices against a Liturgy. I thought it must be cold and formal, and that the book must distract attention. But, in attending to its effect upon my own mind, I have felt a repose, an assurance, an authority in the accepted form, a dignity in the service, a freedom from individual peculiarities, that have given me great comfort and satisfaction. And although there is sometimes to be heard an almost inspired prayer, that is better than any thing else; yet I am prepared to say, that, in the ordinary administrations of the altar, I had rather trust a Liturgy than any other mode of worship.

But there is one further advantage, that seems to me one of great, general, and permanent interest to any church or denomination of Christians. A Liturgy is a strong and excellent bond of attachment to a church, of union among its members, of perpetuity in the institution. This is a matter of especial interest to us as a body of Christians.

There are two views to be taken of our influence and action as a church. The one is, of the effect we may

produce, by our preaching, by our writings, by our appeals, through literature and the press, to the public mind. I believe that we have done much in this way; and my own habits of mind, I confess, lead me to estimate it very highly. But I naturally desire, at the same time, to see a stable and permanent church, — an abiding institution, beneath whose shadow we and our children may sit, and find strength and refreshment for years and ages to come. This is the other form of influence.

Now, in this last respect, it is obvious that we are exposed to unusual danger. Our free thought, our extreme individualism, our perfect catholicity, and the advantage given by it to the more exclusive bodies around us, in cases of intermarriage and in other social relationships, — all this most seriously threatens the perpetuity of our churches. And the best bond for perpetuity that I know of is to be found in a Liturgy; and it is the only one that *we can* have. *Our* bond cannot be any precise institution, canon, or creed; but it may be the bond of common prayer. And, I repeat, it is the best of all visible bonds. It is that, I believe, which, more than any and every other, attaches to their communion the members of the Church of England. And among ourselves, I believe that, for a similar reason, there is no church which has such a fast hold upon the affections of its members as King's Chapel in Boston. When they have been absent from it for a while, in travel or summer retirement from the city, they return to their own service, I am told, with the greatest satisfaction and delight. It is a good bond. Sacred associations interweave themselves with it, and make it every year stronger and stronger. It consecrates birth and burial, marriage and the holy communion of worship. It is the memory of childhood and the solace of age. It links together the generations, and leads them to the everlasting home.

I would cherish the holy fire that is kindled in our churches, and pray God that it may never go out. Far off be the day, — never come the day, — when these churches shall be dead and extinct! No one could desire more than I do, that all churches were merged into one, — one undivided, catholic, liberal, Christian Church. But till that day come, let these Unitarian churches hold

up their testimony. I know how this word Unitarianism looks and sounds to the world around me. I know the mingled reproach and respect in which it is held. I know it all. Yet in this communion, which has no earthly respectability but its character, I accept my lot. I did not choose my religion for honor or good report. Nay, Sir, permit me to say, reproach has made it dear. I have a touch of the Puritan, may I say of the martyr, spirit in me, and I cling to my faith all the more for the reproach it bears. Yes, Sir, this poor Unitarianism, as it may appear to some, — poor in esteem, poor in resources, — it is dearer to me, it is *richer*, than the plenitude of the Roman See, or of the Primacy of all England. And therefore would I perpetuate it; I would send it down to my children. The treasure of this faith, Sir, — our young people may not value it, — our children may not know what it has cost us, — may not know what furnace it has passed through, — but let us garner it up for them; let us enshrine it in holy altars; let us insure to it all the perpetuity that can be given, by wise institutions, by fidelity, and prayer, and trust in Heaven.

ART. III. — REFLECTIONS.

To command one's spirit is the first step towards commanding one's destiny.

Every fault left uncorrected impairs self-reliance; for how can a man rely upon himself, if he habitually fails to do what his conscience bids?

Duties in general, like that class of them called debts, give more trouble the longer they remain undischarged.

Men dress truth for others' eyes and strip it for their own.

Men's arguments often prove nothing but their wishes.

Boswell's Life of Johnson differs from most biographies, as a living man differs from a statue.

We understand the past better than the present.

None are so weary as those who never work.

He who cannot determine what he ought to do is likely to do little.

The present is the mould of the future.

Remorse often barbs the arrows of affliction.

The progress of the world is continually converting virtues into vices.

Some showy quality often screens a number of unsightly ones.

Inveterate youth is one of the worst infirmities of age.

Some men go through the world *incognito*.

The young think evil accidental; the old know that it is constitutional.

Men strive for more good, when they should strive for higher good.

Consumed with cares and labors low,
They dwindle as their fortunes grow.

Great motives publicly presented are often a cover for small motives privately pressed, or still more privately acted on.

Public men of high reputation are like lions in a menagerie, continually stirred up, that the crowd may see their size and hear their roar.

Truths are often admitted long before they are acted on. Habit is but slowly overcome by conviction.

The punishment of a sinful act often consists in the strength that it gives to a sinful habit.

Men are often resigned, but never contented.

Some men think themselves inspired when they are only inflated.

Undeserved popularity is the prelude to contempt.

Is forgetfulness any thing more than the temporary displacement of one idea by another?

The world's waste would supply the world's want.

In whatever shape evil comes, we are apt to exclaim, with Hamlet, "Take any shape but that!"

When men try to get more good than comes from well-doing, they always get less.

Most men die before they have learned to live.

We cannot escape the evils of life by shrinking from its duties.

When we suffer remorse in dreams for imaginary sin, we have the benefit of a warning without the consequences of guilt.

The exercise of good affections is as necessary to happiness as the exercise of the body is to health.

If life improves the character, death will improve the condition.

From the coöperation of the faculties, their cultivation increases their power in a geometrical ratio.

Much of what is called the light of nature is only the light of revelation reflected from nature.

A man must be willing to be seen through, if he wishes to be trusted.

Thoughts and expressions become rounded and polished by being revolved in the mind, as pebbles by being rolled in the sea.

A disagreeable duty should be done as a dose of medicine should be swallowed, without allowing one's self to think beforehand of its unpleasantness.

There are two kinds of evils, those which cannot be cured and those which can. Much of the unhappiness which is referred to the former should be ascribed to the latter.

Contrivances for making easier what was easy before, often cost more trouble than they save.

He who wins applause may, by his eagerness for it, lose respect. But respect is better than fame. One of the worst kinds of dependence is dependence on applause for happiness.

There would be little strife between the rich and the poor, if the rich were uniformly just and kind and unostentatious.

A man's true prosperity often begins when he is said to be ruined ; and his ruin when he is said to be prospering.

The strife with evil never ceases. We are afloat in a leaky ship, and must keep pumping to keep from going down.

The birth of a new good is usually accompanied by the death of an old one.

Children's memories may be filled by study, but their powers of thought and action are developed by play.

The day of small things is often the day of great men.

The habit of living, rather than the love of life, causes the dread of death.

The great leaders of mankind sit apart from the crowd, like the Merlin of romance, whom the popular idols revered and obeyed.

Intellectual progress resembles physical. Those who climb heights move slower than those who cross the plain.

Philosophy may fail in the hour of trial, and yet may break a man's fall or help him to recover from it.

Love and respect are virtue's reward and support.

The surest way to improve one's condition is to improve one's self.

Those who aim only at accomplishments will accomplish but little.

Continual change of course is continual loss of momentum.

Eloquence consists, not in the spoken words, but in the feeling with which they are spoken and their suitability to the occasion.

The look of Cervantes's *Grisostomo* was a benediction; the look of many others is a curse or an insult.

Life is most wearisome when it is worst spent.

A man cannot be generally admired, if his merits are above the general comprehension.

Some men act with ease because they act without scruples.

Children sometimes appear wiser than they are, because their words have more meaning than they are aware of.

Heedless of warning till too late,
The foolish call their folly fate.

Much labor is unseen, so that tasks usually seem easier than they are.

The more knowledge a man has, the more numerous are the associations in his mind between new knowledge and old, and the stronger his hold on what he acquires.

An explanation, so called, is often but a change of statement, that serves no purpose but to stop the mouths of inquirers.

The cheek reddens as forgotten follies start to life. This is a foretaste of future retribution.

Some writer says that most great actions are performed before the age of thirty years. Perhaps this is true of the acts most likely to excite admiration. For men in middle life are generally unwilling to make excessive efforts or take great risks; they have learned that the brilliant achievements of early manhood frequently make men old in their prime. The oil which should have lasted them through life has been consumed in one splendid illumination.

Men are very apt to over-estimate those who are superior to themselves. Not being able to see round them, they exaggerate their dimensions.

The young show their weaknesses because they have not learned to conceal them; the old, because they care little about the opinions of those around them.

A man who had made a fortune by industry and close economy, in a retail business, at length retired from trade, and used to loan his money on interest. One day, in midsummer, a friend happened to say to him: "How pleasant it is to have such long, bright days!" "Why, ye-e-s," replied he, "but these long days the interest comes in *so* slow!"

A gentleman far advanced in life having lost his teeth, and being advised to get a set of artificial ones, replied, that he "did not think them good estate to leave."

Lord Brougham, in his *Life of Watt*, remarks, that the lawsuits, which usually follow patents for important inventions, have often injured the inventor more than the monopoly has benefited him. He thinks that it would be, in many cases, much better for the inventor to rely for profit on the preference that would naturally be given to articles of his manufacture, than to attempt to exclude competition by a patent.

The power of mental abstraction is naturally connected with superiority of intellect. For the more a man is superior to those around him, the less importance does he attach to their sayings and doings. And it is usually easy to withdraw the attention from what is considered not worth attending to.

Men show how much they are interested in moral and religious truth, by the attention which they give to the statement of its elementary principles, though reiterated unceasingly.

It is considered praise to say of a man born to wealth, that he might have been something if it had not been for his fortune.

The good man sees, amid life's evening shades,
The future brighten as the present fades ;
Before earth's lingering light has passed away
He hails the dawning of an endless day.

We live beneath a cloudy sky,
And hear the thunder rolling nigh,
And see the lightning falling fast,
And know 't will strike our roof at last ;
And have we no protecting rod ?
Yes, faith that points to heaven and God,
Steadfast and lofty, to disarm
The bolts that strike of power to harm.

When grief and joy, like shade and sun,
Through life's short day their round have run,
We close our eyes, and all is night ;
We open them, and all is light.

No billows toss, no tempests blow,
In ocean's depths, where, builded slow,
The coral insect's structures grow
To lofty, everlasting piles,
Which gem the sea with lovely isles.
So builds the soul the fancies high
And thoughts sublime that never die ;
Slowly they rise, until at length,
Complete in beauty and in strength,
The immortal structures of the mind
Stand forth to charm and cheer mankind.

Like animals that sleep by day,
Man dreams his little life away,
Nor truly wakes and lives, till death
Has closed his eyes and stopped his breath.

As the gay rover of the field,
Long in a crawling worm concealed,
When, quickened by the summer sun,
He feels a higher life begun,
Soars from the reptile and the earth
To the bright skies that gave him birth,
We, when our little day is spent,
And earth resumes the clay she lent,
Expatriate in an ampler zone,
To faith and fancy only known,
And slake a deeper thirst than parches
The Arab in his desert marches,

The thirst for good without alloy;
No double-faced, delusive joy,
That keeps its promise but in part,
Filling the eye to mock the heart,
But such as springs from reason's reign
And hearts devoid of passion's stain,
From eyes that look through every juggle,
And virtue grown too strong to struggle,
From faith that brightens into sight,
And life immortal brought to light.

There truth stands forth distinctly seen,
With no distorting glass between;
And reason's war with feeling ends;
And head and heart at length are friends;
And, trial and temptation done,
Desire and duty blend in one;
And morning breaks, and night's alarms
Are hushed in God's protecting arms.

The good of the community is often connected with harm to individuals. But they who suffer from one improvement are benefited by a hundred.

It would be well for those who imitate the follies of the great, to consider how much their follies detract from their greatness.

Good got is often lost; good done, never.

Though man may quit his sins, he'll find
They always leave their stings behind.

How few are the luminaries in the intellectual firmament which shine for ever round the pole!

The definition of "verb" is true of "man," — "a word which signifies to be, to do, and to suffer."

The readers of English law learn that "the king can do no wrong"; the readers of English history learn that it is not for want of trying.

States of feeling often result from associations not immediately perceived, perhaps not perceived at all without careful examination. For instance, a particular feeling may be often awakened on passing a particular spot, without our being able to recollect distinctly the origin of the association.

The only thing which every one can do, and the only thing which any one need do, is his duty.

The virtues of half the world grow in a great degree out of the vices of the other half.

Vanity is the union of self-conceit and love of distinction, too strong to be concealed.

Hasty speeches commit men to foolish courses.

When a man has become eminent, it is not easy for strangers to think of him as having been obscure; so that the sayings and doings of his early manhood seem as if they must have had much influence, when perhaps they had very little.

A good writer avoids superfluity, as a good man avoids sin.

Young persons often err grievously, when they suppose certain practices to be safe because others have pursued them without apparent harm. For many men of fair exterior suffer from infirmities known to few. Those who cite their example would often be dismayed if they knew their condition.

No one can obtain more than a moderate amount of good, and perhaps no one who rightly uses his means need have less.

Much of what is called poetry and philosophy makes the reader feel as if he were dragged in a sleigh over bare ground.

One of the manufactures in which our countrymen have made the most progress is the manufacture of public opinion. The principle, that, to interest others, one must be interested himself, is illustrated by the success of interested parties in interesting the public.

Fame is often acquired by excelling in particulars in which men cannot excel without degradation.

Alike to cobblers and to kings,
The highest good from goodness springs.

In the following lines the writer has put into verse some thoughts which he found in prose : —

Harsh words are like the hail which beats
The herbage to the ground ;
Kind words are like the gentle rain
Which scatters freshness round.

As polished steel receives a stain
From drops at random flung,
So does the child, when words profane
Drop from a parent's tongue.
The rust eats in, and oft we find
That naught which we can do,
To cleanse the metal or the mind,
The brightness will renew.

The most important truths are the most common, and the persons most wearied by their repetition stand most in need of their application ; so that few accomplishments are more valuable, than the power of presenting agreeably the common truths of religion and morality. In fact, one of the chief offices of striking thoughts is to enforce common ones, and renew that respect for them which familiarity had diminished. A great truth cannot produce its full effect until it has become a truism.

Refinement easily runs into fastidiousness, which unfits a man to receive pleasure or to impart it.

Obscurity leaves a man free ; but a famous man is a slave to his fame. Incense is bought dear. "Uneasy lies the head that wears a crown," although the crown may be of laurels.

The best safeguard is the sense of danger and of duty.

The chief happiness of this life is the hope of a better one.

Moral maxims are usually partial in character, from the weakness of the understanding, and general in form, from the strength of the feelings.

How much happier we should be, but for evils that never come !

A good heart is the best friend of a good head.

Double-dealing makes men distrustful, but none so much so as the double-dealer himself. In fact, his incredulity often amounts to folly, and disqualifies him from weighing evidence and profiting by others' knowledge.

Nothing subdues the irritation of a man of generous spirit sooner than to see that he has given pain, without having excited resentment.

Desires and fears often ought to change places.

Men of easy tempers usually show their emotions more readily than men of strong passions. The latter learn self-control by finding the need of it. The current of the former's nature, being quiet, is allowed to take its course.

The sculptor sees a statue, and the philosopher a principle, where to the general eye all is "without form and void."

The fact, that the word WORTH, when applied to character, means moral worth, shows that, though men may be dazzled by intellectual brilliancy, their real respect cannot be won without virtue. There is no patriotism equal to that of a spotless life.

Men form their opinions, as mineralogists form their cabinets, partly by their own labor, but principally by interchange.

The men whose pursuits call their reasoning powers habitually into vigorous exercise are said to furnish few patients to insane hospitals; while persons who have cultivated the imagination much and the reason little often become the victims of visions which they cannot distinguish from realities.

Shakspeare says, that "the fashion doth wear out more apparel than the man." In this way the caprices of the rich help to supply the wants of the poor.

The dates of year 1, year 2, &c., which we see in books printed in France during the Revolution, suggest the idea

that the French revolutionists, when they gave up reckoning from the birth of Christ, began to reckon from the birth of Antichrist.

Names are a sort of intellectual currency to facilitate the exchange of ideas.

Men's self-conceit springs in a great measure from inability to appreciate merit different from their own.

We sometimes laugh at persons for professing principles with which their conduct is inconsistent. But we forget that the principles which a man feels to be most necessary are often the ones which he finds it hardest to obey.

Ideas hang together in the mind by numerous hooks, and the more ideas a man has, the more can he hitch on.

Men who make a great fuss usually make a small figure.

Light as folly is, it often weighs down wisdom.

The marvels of science are fast supplanting the marvels of superstition.

Great talkers think aloud. They resemble young children, who cannot read without speaking.

Self-discipline without the discipline of external circumstances is too often like Sancho Panza's self-flagellation.

Success is no security against disappointment.

Few men use all their means of happiness.

Honor may diminish desert. A giant made a show of does not work.

It is fortunate for public speakers that debates cannot be daguerreotyped.

A reformer usually makes converts slowly. Conscience struggles long before it overcomes the force of habit and the influence of prescription.

Christianity probably makes some progress. Pride and revenge are held in less esteem than formerly.

Men are continually passing the point at which luxuries become inconveniences.

Men and women are usually mated by the rule of contraries. This seems to be a provision of nature, that husband and wife may supply each other's deficiencies, and be saved from interference and rivalry.

Uncontrolled sensibility makes men shrink from seeing and doing much that might improve themselves and benefit others.

We seldom make sufficient allowance beforehand for the difficulties that cannot be foreseen.

If a man's powers are faithfully cultivated, will they not increase in greater proportion than his trials?

From neglect to scrutinize the grounds of their reasoning, men continually allow to unfounded impressions the authority due only to facts.

Hymns compiled for churches and extracts for school-books often contain obvious blemishes. Should these be left to vitiate the taste of mixed audiences and young minds? Is it not best to change the text, and preserve the original in foot-notes?

Some persons are foolish enough to do wrong, in order to be unlike those they dislike.

Thoughts often lie in the mind in the form of tangled skeins. But if a writer gives them to the world in this form, few readers will take the trouble to disentangle them.

From much that we learn and do, we gain little but the knowledge that it is not worth learning and doing.

If men did not derive the idea of a Supreme Being, of infinite power, purity, and benevolence, from revelation, it must have come from the light of nature; in which case, nature shows God to be such a being as would have been likely to make a revelation in aid of those who are not apt learners of nature's lessons.

The needle seeks the star that lights the pole ;
So flies to thee, O God ! the trembling soul.
Though oft it deviates far, it still returns
To rest where thy unchanging glory burns ;
And fixed in calm repose can never be,
Till freed from all that draws away from thee.

Sidney Smith well observes, that "a man is happier for having been happy."

Pleasant recollections promote cheerfulness, and painful ones gloom. Thus the happiness which flows from the right regulation of the feelings tends to perpetuate itself.

The best solace of affliction, next to religious trust, is necessary labor.

Severe trials call into action those reserved forces of thought and courage and fortitude and faith, which give the victory in the battle of life.

More effort of mind is necessary to apply words correctly, than we are usually conscious of. If mind and body are languid, a man frequently uses one word when he intends to use another.

Habitual feeling leaves a stamp on the countenance which often masks the feeling of the moment.

Some writers throw out words seemingly as a challenge to ingenious readers to find ideas to fit them.

Some men have saddle-bag minds, in which wisdom is balanced by folly.

Scruples are like the sand-bags in a balloon. He who throws them all overboard rises with ease, but is likely to come down with a jounce.

Deference is often derision in disguise.

It is not uncommon to meet with men who have learned the art of turning brass into gold.

The best time to help people generally is when they wish to be helped.

Much offence arises from misconstruction ; but what appears to be well meant should be well taken.

The face of nature is the footprint of God.

The recollection of a man's former appearance often blends in the spectator's mind with his present looks, and thus prevents the old from seeing their friends as they appear to strangers.

Wisdom to prevent emergencies is as desirable as ability to meet them.

If a man will not endure the pain of probing his own faults, he cannot have the satisfaction of curing them.

Enduring fame depends mainly on enduring effects. Posterity cares little about any but those who have done something that affects posterity's interests.

Most men labor mainly to obtain comforts or luxuries for themselves or their families. When their circumstances have become easy, the selfishness which made them active makes them idle. This is one great cause of mental decay in advanced years. We may add, that a business of routine, which habit has made easy, is often pursued industriously with little mental activity ; so that a man may be rusting out, while he is held up as a pattern of industry.

Immethodical habits often cause a man painful doubts as to whether he has done all that he ought to have done and intended to do.

He who forsakes life's duties through fear of its temptations, declares his Lord a hard master, and buries his talent in the earth.

Established truths are often confounded with obvious ones. They who would have been least able to discover them are least able to understand the difficulty of the discovery.

New ideas require new words, or the use of old words in new senses. Hence languages are continually changing.

The apparent precocity of young children is often only

apparent, arising from their having caught the language and manners of their adult companions.

Some persons make a long story short; but most persons make a short story long.

Many a brilliant reputation resembles a pageant, — showy and unsubstantial, attracting the acclamations of the crowd, and forgotten as soon as it has passed.

Though countless millions have navigated the sea of life, every one sails through parts unknown.

With feelings strong and reason weak
And wisdom scarce begun,
We often shun what we should seek,
And seek what we should shun.

A virtuous or vicious act to-day, by strengthening our good or bad habits, may determine our good or bad fortune a year hence.

The wheels of the mind may be much obstructed by a single wrong opinion, and he who removes this may help forward mankind.

E. W.

ART. IV. — THE COUNCIL OF EPHESUS.

At the beginning of the fifth century, the feeling and conviction of the religious world, in relation to the person of Christ, assumed two directions, which were, in many respects, at variance with each other. Neander has described this difference as being that existing between the fact, on the one hand, of God's becoming a man, and that, on the other hand, of a mere influence of God upon a man. Those who loved clear and sharply defined conceptions looked upon Christ as a man possessed and inhabited by God, so that there was a separable union in the Saviour of the human and the divine; while others, who approached the subject chiefly on the side of feeling and mystic contemplation, contended that God actually *became* a man, so that there was no con-

ceivable separation of the two persons in Jesus Christ. This latter view was maintained with zeal in Alexandria, and the former was more welcome in the churches of Asia Minor and Palestine.

Our object now is to see how these two views came into sharp conflict with each other in that remarkable scene of passion and strife, — the Council of Ephesus; or rather let us say, that we may mark how the ambition, envy, and selfishness of a few restless spirits of that age seized hold of this dogmatic difference as an instrument to accomplish their own private ends, it being true in this case, as in so many others, that the passion sought the object, not that the object created the passion.

It was in April of the year 428 that an eloquent and gifted young man was ordained Bishop over the affluent and splendid see of Constantinople. He had the characteristic fervor of his native land, Syria, and a training in the schools of Antioch had both made him master of the learning of the times, and confirmed his attachment to the theology of the East. His brilliant promise was soon known at the court of Theodosius the Second, and the young preacher was transferred to what was then the most coveted ecclesiastical position in the world.

Nestorius soon gave proof that the quiet life he had hitherto led in the cloisters but poorly fitted him for the management of complicated public affairs, near a corrupt court, in the midst of intrigue, and surrounded by men who were adepts in the arts of the world. Some of them were from the very first hostile to the young Syrian who had been exalted above them, and were ready to improve any opportunity to kindle a flame of popular discontent. The indiscreet zeal of the new bishop was displayed in the first sermon he preached in the hearing of the Emperor, whom he addressed directly in these words: "Sire, free the earth from heretics, and I will give you heaven. Join in the war against them with me, and I will assist you against the Persians." Within five days after this, Nestorius caused an Arian church to be demolished, and adopted rigorous measures against those who kept Easter on the fourteenth day of the month. He little thought how soon the weapons of persecution, which he grasped with a willing hand, would be directed against himself!

It is not to be supposed that this intolerance did any great violence to the semi-barbarous spirit of that age; still there were those who were amazed to see a man, as it was said, "before he had tasted the water of the city," declare that he would root out all those who were not of his opinion. An instrument to check him, and perhaps to overthrow him, was soon presented to their use.

Among those who had come from Antioch with Nestorius was a certain priest, Anastasius by name, who, in the course of a sermon which he preached in Constantinople, had said: "Let no man call Mary the Mother of God. Mary was a woman, and God cannot be born of a woman." The sentiment brought up at once the radical difference in the two ways of regarding the person of Christ, before adverted to, and soon all Constantinople was in commotion.

As we look back upon that age, and especially upon that city, nothing surprises us more than the passion which then prevailed for discussing controverted questions of divinity. All interest in religion centred in petty and frivolous points, and was absorbed upon them. An amusing illustration of the fact is presented by Gregory Nyssa, who, writing of Constantinople only some fifty years later than this, says: "The city is full of mechanics and slaves, who are all of them Doctors of Divinity, and preach in the shops and in the streets. If you desire a man to change a piece of silver, he informs you wherein the Son differs from the Father; if you ask the price of a loaf, you are told, by way of reply, that the Son is inferior to the Father; if you inquire whether the bath is ready, the answer is, that the Son was made out of nothing." As to the statement of Anastasius, it was regarded as a direct attack upon the established and favorite way of regarding the person of Christ. It was contended, that, if the two natures of Christ were divided after their union, distinguishing between the Son of God and the Son of Man, only a union of dignity, authority, and power was allowed, and not a real and substantial union that made both one. Beside, such a statement was derogatory to the Blessed Virgin, who was thus made mother only of a man; and cursed was every one who withheld from her the great and only distinction that set her apart from all other women, — that of being

the Mother of God. To have such a heresy proclaimed among them by foreign preachers, themselves pretending to be zealous against heretics, was not to be endured; and Nestorius little foresaw what a storm he was raising against himself, when he avowed his intention to defend the position of his preacher Anastasius.

The few glimpses that we get of the conduct of Nestorius, at this point of his life, serve to elevate him in our regard. He appears modest and candid, and, while firm in his own convictions of truth, still was anxious to pursue a path of reconciliation and peace. By a large party in the imperial city his highly rhetorical and impassioned eloquence was warmly applauded, and not unfrequently they expressed their approbation in the midst of his discourses, according to the custom of the time, by cheers and clapping of the hands. "I do not judge the love you bear to me by your shouts," was once his reply to such commendation. On another occasion, from the vociferous applause he received, he feared he had not been sufficiently faithful in stating his own idea, which he knew was not the popular one, and therefore he went back and repeated it again, reaffirming in stronger words his own conviction, saying, as he did it, "Your applause makes me suspicious." Another incident may be stated in the words of Neander.

"On a certain occasion, when Nestorius was inveighing against the doctrine which represented Mary as the Mother of God, and contrasting the eternal generation of the Logos with the temporal nativity of *the man* whom the Logos assumed as his instrument, an individual of rank, no longer able to restrain himself, cried out: "No; the eternal Logos himself condescended also to the second birth." Immediately a violent commotion arose among the assembled multitude, one party taking the side of the Patriarch, the other that of his opponent. Nestorius did not allow himself to be embarrassed by this incident. He once more resumed his discourse, praised the zeal of his friends, and, having refuted the sudden opponent, whom he called a poor, miserable trifler, proceeded with the discussion after his usual manner." — *Church History*, Vol. II. p. 450.

It appears that on another occasion, when he was preaching on this subject, he declared that he had no objection to calling Mary the Mother of God, provided this was done by that figure of speech which the Greeks

called *ἀντίδοσις*, by which the idioms or properties of two objects are transferred each to the other, for the sake of popular impression and effect, — a discrimination like that which, in the latest phraseology, we have learned to make by the phrases, the Theology of the Feelings, and the Theology of the Intellect. But Nestorius firmly rejected the idea of actually regarding the Virgin as a goddess, and preferred to give her the title which could lead to no misapprehension, — the Mother of Christ.

It is not unlikely that the Constantinopolitan agitations would have in time quietly subsided, had it not been for a foreign interference of a crafty and ambitious nature, to which our attention is now called. Just across the Mediterranean, in the ancient and celebrated see of Alexandria, was a bishop, whose fourteen years of office and power had nurtured an ambition which could no longer be confined within the limits of his episcopate. Gibbon says of Cyril, in words which no knowledge of that prelate's character will permit us to soften: "His enmity to the Byzantine pontiffs was a sense of interest, not a sally of passion: he envied their fortunate position in the sunshine of the imperial court; and he dreaded their upstart ambition, which oppressed the metropolitans of Europe and Asia, invaded the provinces of Antioch and Alexandria, and measured their diocese by the limits of the empire. The long moderation of Atticus, the mild usurper of the throne of Chrysostom, suspended the animosities of the Eastern Patriarchs; but Cyril was at length awakened by the exaltation of a rival more worthy of his esteem and hatred."

It would take us too much away from our main purpose to dwell at any length upon the previous history of this bishop, and yet some correct idea of his character will throw a clearer light upon the course which we shall now see him pursue. There appears to have been no ambiguity as to his character and life. All historians agree in their descriptions of the man. Subtlety, cunning, selfishness, ambition, cruelty, an unscrupulous readiness to use any means to compass his ends, — these are the traits which with singular unanimity are ascribed to him. The title of *Saint* prefixed to his name is but little more than "a mark that his opinions and his party have finally prevailed." In the administration of affairs

in his own diocese, he proceeded with such rashness, insolence, and unfeeling selfishness, that on one occasion, "as he passed through the streets," to quote the words of Gibbon, "his chariot was assaulted by a band of five hundred Nitrian monks, his guards fled from the wild beasts of the desert, his protestations that he was a Christian and a Catholic were answered by a volley of stones." A still fouler blot on his memory was his instigation of the murder of Hypatia, an eminent female philosopher, amid circumstances of barbarity which we need not here recall. Dupin says he had "a subtle and metaphysical genius, was wonderfully ready at composing, and applied himself to a way of writing, which it is easy to furnish out, when we bestow no time to polish our discourse, nor keep it within certain bounds, and we resign up our hand and pen entirely to all the notions that come into the head"; and Neander describes the man as guilty of falsehood and bribery, addicted to a cunning policy, cherishing an unbounded ambition, and "attracted by an opportunity so inviting, of extending the dominion which he exercised in the Egyptian Church over a still wider field."

The first thing which this crafty prelate did, as an interference with the state of affairs at Constantinople, was to publish an admonitory letter, addressed to his own Egyptian monks, affirming in strong language the right of the Blessed Virgin to the title Mother of God, representing that to deny this was the same as to say that Mary gave birth only to a mere man, and warning all against heretical views, which he had reason to fear were abroad in the world.

Some ecclesiastical historians are of opinion that the condition of Cyril's own diocese called for such a letter as this, because the sermons of Nestorius had been circulated in Egypt, where some of the monks seemed disposed to embrace his views. Dupin puts forward this apology for Cyril, an apology, however, to which Neander allows no weight. He says that the monks of Egypt had never shown the least favor to the Eastern scheme of doctrine, that they had always been the supple tools of their bishop, that the danger of infection from Constantinople could not have required any unusual precaution, that it is evident Cyril was not in

earnest in what he had said, and that his letter had for its "express design, instead of suppressing, to foment the dispute, and to add to its importance."

This was certainly its effect. It was not long before Cyril's letter was in the hands of the disaffected in Constantinople, who immediately looked to the powerful Bishop of Alexandria as their leader, and felt strengthened and emboldened. An answer to it was soon sent out by one Photius, prepared, it is said, by order of Nestorius. Cyril replied to this, in a letter addressed directly to the Constantinopolitan prelate, urging him to appease the growing disturbances by retracting his error, and giving the Virgin Mary her rightful title of Mother of God. As this letter was carried to Nestorius by one of Cyril's priests, who was urgent for an answer, Nestorius wrote a reply which all accounts represent as conceived in a spirit of kindness and love. He told *St. Cyril*, to use the words of Dupin, "that though he had acted contrary to the rules of brotherly charity, yet he would forget it, and did by this letter give him the tokens of union and peace."

But union and peace were not the objects which the Alexandrian prelate desired, and he hit upon a device which greatly favored his plans of schism and strife. It must be remembered that these events took place before the rivalry between the see of Rome and that of Constantinople had terminated in the triumph of the former, and when the "Successor of St. Peter" was glad of any opportunity to check the growing power of his great competitor. On the part of Cyril, no stroke of policy could have better served his turn, than to pour complaints of Nestorius's heresy into the ear of Pope Celestine, who was glad to have his brother of Constantinople in any way subjected to his power. But as the cunning are usually the cowardly too, it was in character for Cyril, when charged with making one-sided and false representations to the Pope, to profess his ignorance that Celestine had any knowledge of their disputes. Nestorius, thinking that his sermons would be the best refutation of any charge of heresy, sent copies of them to the Bishop of Rome, which, however, were laid away unread, as the Pope did not understand Greek. Cyril diligently followed up his success by sending an agent to

Rome, to make personal solicitation for a condemnation of Nestorius; and at length had the satisfaction of hearing, that at a synod held in August, 430, the opinions of Nestorius were branded as heresy, and the writings of Cyril were approved. But this was not all. The sting of this synod was in the further decree, that if Nestorius, after ten days' deliberation, did not recant, he should be degraded from his episcopal dignity; and his enemy at Alexandria was charged with the execution of the sentence.

Would the Emperor and the primate of the East submit to the mandate of an Italian priest? There was little in the temper of the times that inclined them to yield. Still less could they bear the idea of submission to this Egyptian arrogance. Conscious that he had not the power to enforce the Pope's sentence, Cyril postponed any attempt at its execution, but meanwhile was busy in stirring up all the elements of strife which he could possibly move. "Put an end to the dispute," wrote an aged abbot, — Isidore of Pelusium, — who on account of his advanced years assumed a certain tone of authority in a letter to Cyril, "lest you bring down upon yourself the judgment of God. Let not the punishment which you deem it necessary to inflict on mortal men, on account of personal grievances, fall upon the living Church. Prepare not the way for perpetual divisions in the Church under the pretence of piety." A priest of Alexandria, Lampon by name, undertook of his own accord to act the part of a mediator of peace, for which purpose he went to Constantinople. Through his spirit of Christian love, Nestorius consented to write one more letter to Cyril, although he had before resolved to have no more communication with him. Neander gives an extract from this letter, as a fair image of the writer's heart. "Nothing is of more power," he writes, "than Christian gentleness. By this man's might I have been conquered; for I confess I am seized with great fear, when I perceive in any man the spirit of Christian gentleness; — it is as if God dwelt in him." But all such counsels and considerations seem to have done nothing to tame the fierce spirit of Cyril; for we read that in the November of that same year, 430, he called a council in Egypt, who published twelve anathemas, each one

aimed directly against Nestorius, and resolved that, if that heretic did not renounce his errors, they should proceed to execute the judgment pronounced by the Western bishops. When Cyril's twelve anathemas were known at Constantinople, Nestorius published a statement of his own belief, drawn up likewise in twelve distinct heads, so that all could see at once the points where these prelates disagreed.

While affairs were in this posture, Nestorius, for the sake of unity and peace, advised the Emperor, Theodosius the Second, to summon a General Council. This was a step to which the opinion of that age readily turned. In the fourth and fifth centuries there were two hundred and four Councils. We have often thought that the immense influence which these congresses must have exerted, as a part of the education of the ecclesiastics of that age, has never been fully appreciated. They were occupied in the discussion of what were believed to be great questions of doctrine and discipline; they assembled the best talent of the whole Christian world; they constituted colleges of mutual instruction; and having for their origin the civil spirit of federation in the old Amphictyonic Councils of Greece,* these representative assemblies of church communities may rightfully be regarded as the parents of the parliaments and congresses of our modern civilization. Yielding to his sense of the needs of his distracted times, Theodosius issued a circular letter, bearing date November 19, 430, calling the metropolitans of all countries of the Roman Empire to a Council, to be held on the following Feast of Pentecost, which fell, in the year 431, on the seventh day of June, and the city of Ephesus was named as the place of assembly.

No reader of Gibbon will forget the amusing account he gives, on the authority of an author of the fourth century, of the scenes witnessed throughout the Roman Empire at the gathering of a Council. The Emperor gave an order to its members for the free use of the national posts, and a competent allowance for the expenses of the way; and then, says Ammianus, "the highways were covered with troops of bishops galloping from every

* Gibbon, Chap. XV.

side to the assemblies, which they call synods; and while they labored to reduce the whole sect to their own particular opinions, the public establishment of the posts was almost ruined by their hasty and repeated journeys." The excitement attending these Councils drew together immense numbers of persons beside those officially connected with them; and we are told that at the Council of Nice, A. D. 325, which is said to have consisted of 318 bishops, no less than 2,048 ecclesiastics were present.

Early in the spring of 431, throughout the whole empire, the note of preparation was sounded, for the great contest which was to mark this year. Cyril was the first to reach Ephesus, at which place he arrived on the 1st of June, bringing with him fifty bishops, "his devoted tools," beside "a numerous body of mariners, slaves, and fanatics, enlisted with blind obedience under the banner of St. Mark, and the Mother of God." Nestorius soon made his appearance, attended by ten bishops and a strong military guard appointed by Theodosius to protect his primate against the rabble; and Juvenal also arrived with some bishops of Palestine. The day named in the Emperor's letter passed without the appearance either of the legates of the Bishop of Rome, or of John of Antioch, and his bishops of Asia Minor, these last being detained by some popular tumults arising from a famine, and by heavy rains, which had impeded the ways. It was on the 22d of June, that Cyril and his party determined to wait no longer. Accordingly, they assembled in the great church of Saint Mary's, to the number of about two hundred. It was in vain that sixty-eight bishops, with Nestorius at their head, objected to their proceeding until the full Council had assembled; and in vain, too, that the Emperor's commissioner, the Count Candidian, earnestly protested, declaring that the Emperor's design was for a General Council and not a sectional assembly. Cyril was appointed President. Peter the notary read the circular letter sent to the metropolitans. Memnon, the Bishop of Ephesus, warmly in the interest of Cyril, urged their proceeding with despatch. A messenger sent to summon Nestorius brought back word that that prelate would attend when all the members of the Council had reached Ephesus. A second

messenger reported that he could obtain no access through the guards that surrounded the house. Some bishops, charged with a third summons, came back with no better success. The Council then proceeded to business, examining witnesses as to what they had heard Nestorius say, — one of whom had heard him declare that it was an impious assertion that God could be an infant of two or three months old, — hearing garbled extracts from his letters and sermons, and comparing all this with the Nicene Creed, till after only one session, extending, however, late into the night of that same day, they agreed upon a sentence, which was drawn up in the following words : —

“ The most impious heretic, Nestorius, refusing to appear at our citation, and not suffering the holy bishops which we sent to him to enter into his house, we were obliged to examine his cause ; and having convicted him of dispensing and teaching an impious doctrine, as hath been proved as well by his letters and other writings as by the sermons which he hath preached in this metropolis, which hath been confirmed by sufficient testimonies, we have been forced, according to the letter of S. Celestine, Bishop of Rome, to pronounce against him this heavy sentence, which we cannot do but with grief : — Our Lord Jesus Christ, against whom Nestorius hath blasphemed, declares him by this synod deprived of his episcopal dignity, and separated from the communion of the episcopal order.”

This sentence was made known to Nestorius by a letter, in the superscription of which he was called “ another Judas ” ; and information of their proceedings was sent by the Council to the Emperor, to Constantinople, and to Alexandria. The prelates, on coming forth, were hailed by the shouts of an immense and rude rabble, rejoicing that the honor of the Virgin had been vindicated in the very church where, as it was said, her remains reposed ; and songs, illuminations, and other expressions of popular joy filled up the night.

On the 27th of June, John of Antioch, and the twenty-six Eastern bishops that accompanied him, arrived at Ephesus. Some of Cyril's party warned him not to communicate with Nestorius, who had been deposed. But, unwilling to acquiesce in a decision which had been hastily reached, without conference with himself and his friends, who had come so far to give judgment in this

matter, John, "before he had wiped the dust from his shoes," summoned a council in the inn where he stopped ; and learning through Candidian, the imperial commissioner, of the irregularity, prejudice, passion, and violence of the Egyptian party, he caused a sentence of deposition to be passed against Cyril and Memnon, anathematized Cyril's chapters, and excommunicated all who persisted in their communion with that heretic.

This was the great, fatal mistake in the history of these proceedings. The cause of Nestorius received its deepest wound in the house of his friends. If the decision of Cyril's faction was to be set aside as the result of an *ex parte* Council, how could John imagine that the summary and violent course of the Eastern bishops could stand in any better light, or share any better fate ? They had too much hot blood in them to practise that most successful of all arts, — to remain patient as long as one can keep the other party in the wrong. It seems a great pity that the moderate and sensible course which Nestorius preferred was not followed ; for he drew up a history of the whole transaction, which he forwarded to the Emperor, with whom he would leave it to suggest the initiative in the next step that should be taken. Instead of this, for the following three months, Ephesus was the scene of the most scandalous and outrageous broils. Council anathematized council ; churches were filled with soldiers ; mobs collected in the streets ; and rage and clamor, stones, clubs, and the sword, broken heads, and flowing blood, and dying bodies, were the arguments which a frenzied people used to settle an article of their religion. The scene is one of the most striking illustrations of the power of the *odium theologicum* to stir up some of the basest elements of man's depravity ; and what possible chance was there, that the truth could be seen and settled amid all that passion and violence ?

But all this time, what did the Emperor think of the conduct of his prelates ? The weak and undecided Theodosius was greatly perplexed. At his country-house, near Chalcedon, he received eight deputies from each of the two hostile Councils, refusing them audience at his court in Constantinople, through his fear of a tumult among the rabble of monks that thronged the metropolis. With the utmost patience he listened to their charges,

recriminations, quotations from the Fathers, and repetitions of creeds. He was intent all the while to find some compromise that would hush up the present strife; and each party, knowing this to be the first object of the Emperor, became the more clamorous and overbearing in its demands. The temporizing, fluctuating, and imbecile course of Theodosius was disgraceful in the highest degree. Imagining that peace might be restored if the leaders of both factions were out of the way, he decreed that Cyril and Memnon on the one side, and Nestorius on the other, should be deposed. Then comes the history of the arts which Cyril and his party used to procure a revision of this sentence, and to have the decree of deposition fall on Nestorius alone. By bribes freely distributed, wherever such corrupt influence could avail; by promises and threats, which stimulated the popular frenzy to an uncontrollable and almost insane pitch of excitement; by paltry and barefaced tricks, to work upon the superstitious fears of Theodosius, he made the Emperor finally succumb; and, resolving to give up his primate a victim to the Alexandrian tyrant and a sacrifice to the popular rage, Theodosius dismissed the assembled bishops with these words: "God is my witness that I am not the author of this confusion. His providence will discern and punish the guilty. Return to your provinces; and may your private virtues repair the mischief and scandal of your meeting."

It is with a sad feeling that we indicate in a single sentence the subsequent fate of Nestorius. Retreating to his ancient monastery at Antioch, he there passed four years in retirement and prayer, whence he was summoned by an edict of the Emperor, which branded him as a foul and impious heretic, condemned his writings to be burned, and banished his person to the Libyan Desert. Here his life was protracted for sixteen years, and, though suffering much from persecution, he prepared many pastoral letters, which exerted a strong influence upon the men of his times. Accounts differ as to the precise cause of his death, though all agree that it was hastened by violence; and the hatred that was felt for his name was long perpetuated by the tradition, that his tomb was "never watered by the rain of heaven." His banishment did not bring that peace which was expected from this

measure. His being branded as a heretic was the cause of the establishment of an independent body of Christians, surviving to this day, and constituting a line of transmission along which the Christian faith has come down to us in another channel than that of the Papal Church; while the history we have now briefly given furnishes ample proof how much of human rashness, folly, and passion mingled in the great Council by which that Church settled its creed and established its authority.

H. A. M.

ART. V.—THE EVANGELICAL AND THE PHILOSOPHICAL SPIRIT IN RELIGION.

WE propose to gather together, under the above title, some thoughts which are almost daily presented to our minds by our current religious literature. These thoughts attach to the two methods of treating or studying the New Testament. We have, therefore, to discuss some of the relations between the Evangelical and the Philosophical modes of dealing with the Gospel. Perhaps the terms Devotional and Critical, or Devotional and Scientific, would as well answer our purpose and cover our theme.

The Christian faith, in its whole essence and substance, its records, materials, history, and institutions, offers two very distinct points of interest to men, engages two very distinct classes of our human faculties, and suggests two methods and purposes of investigation. All the controversies and discussions which attach to our religion may thus be arranged under two great themes of spiritual and intellectual interest. The one theme has regard to the inner essence and substance of the Gospel; the other is concerned with its external relations to time, history, science, and all other truth. Under one view, we contemplate the Gospel as a disclosure of the relations subsisting between God and man, a scheme for human salvation. Under the other view, the Gospel is subjected to the tests of an inquisitive, if not a sceptical, examination of its own credentials and authority. The one class of our discussions and controversies raises issues

between various parties in the Christian fold, who all profess to believe the Gospel message, while they differ in interpreting it. The other class of discussions and controversies is debated between these believers and those who question the foundations on which they all stand.

The Evangelical view of the Gospel is the application of a devotional or spiritual interest to the substance of the Gospel message. Its aim is to discover and to understand the scheme of doctrinal and practical religion which is taught in the New Testament; to have an intelligible idea of the method there announced for establishing or restoring a true relation between God and men, and to hold with a tenacious fidelity the hope which the Gospel offers. An Evangelical faith accepts the New Testament as an authentic source of knowledge upon every thing that concerns a true religious life. It takes up the sacred volume with a revering, a confiding, and a grateful spirit, regarding it with all the humble and unquestioning trust which could be given to it, if it had been seen to descend from the skies, floating down gently from the heavens into our hands. This Evangelical faith recognizes the inspiration of the New Testament; that is, it recognizes that, either in the literal statements, or in the plain meaning of the records, there is a sacred authority which distinguishes them from all other sources of human knowledge. The records are regarded as containing direct communications from God, disclosures of his will concerning us, his children, and as announcing on what terms his favor is to be secured here and hereafter. The testimony of those records is taken as decisive concerning the relations which now exist, — which exist by nature, as we say, — between God and his children. The Evangelical study of those records aims to learn whether those natural relations need to be changed, and how they may be changed to reconcile earth and heaven. To this end the Bible is studied with a devotion which no words or images can portray. The best thoughts, the silent, deep, and solemn exercises of human minds, are given to it. The best hours of retirement, of sincerity, of sadness or hope, are spent upon it.

The Philosophical method of dealing with our religion is the application to it of the tests of philosophical in-

quiry; the subjecting it to the searching scrutiny of criticism in all its relations to history and science, and to every form and element of truth; the trial of it through the cool and rigid processes by which facts and falsehoods are distinguished. Philosophy, indeed, in a fair and common meaning of the word, has a legitimate and a useful work to do in discussing the facts and the conditions involved in the Evangelical view of the Gospel. But then Philosophy learns instead of teaching; it follows the record, and does not look behind it or beneath it. The more common application of a philosophical spirit or process to the Christian religion is in the way of critical discussion, of sceptical inquiry, of the freest and most searching speculation. It questions the vehicle or instrumentality which is alleged to have been used for conveying truth from God to men; the nature, the materials, the evidences, the effects, the fruits of revelation; the theory and the authentication of miracles, and the general grounds for believing the Gospel to be, as it claims to be, an additional means of knowing the mind of God beyond all the other sources of such knowledge. Philosophy takes up all the questions which curiosity or fancy, a bold inquisitiveness or a restless scepticism, a well-furnished and healthful, or a clouded and hesitating mind, can ask as to the foundations, the materials, the objects, and the warrant for faith, whether found in the consciousness, in the universe, in experience, or in the Bible, and Philosophy works upon these matters in a free way all its own. One needs not to *be* a philosopher in order to pursue this method, only he must *think himself* to be one, and must suppose that he is acting like one.

The difference between the Evangelical and the Philosophical spirit and method as applied to our religion may be illustrated by the two ways of treating a document which professes to be the will of a deceased parent. The children and parties interested in it may take up such a document with an affectionate and reverential spirit, anxious to understand intelligently, and then to follow implicitly all its provisions; to carry out its main intent, and to make their hearty compliance with all that it enjoins a means of proving their love to the testator, and a means of securing their respective shares in its generous bequests. This mode of dealing with a testa-

ment answers to the Evangelical view and use of the Gospel.

But that will, instead of being treated with such filial confidence and respect, may be taken into court and disputed, dividing those concerned in it by many perplexed and painful strifes. Its handwriting may be questioned; the veracity or the competency of its witnesses may be denied; its date, its seal, may be disputed; the terms of the will and its conditions may be sharply criticized, pronounced unreasonable or inconsistent with other known documents or purposes or actions of the testator; and his own title to the property which the will represents may be doubted in the issue. Thus a long suit may be necessary, and all the provisions of the will may be kept in abeyance, and all the wealth of love and means of good which go with it may be buried in chancery till the dispute is closed, if ever it can be closed, without a compromise between the parties to it. This answers, so far as illustration in such a case will answer, to the application of the Philosophical spirit to the Gospel.

Here, then, we have the two leading methods or ways of dealing with the records of the Christian religion; the two widely different purposes with which they are investigated. We have distinguished and defined them with sufficient fulness to answer the purpose now in view. Distinct as these two methods appear in the definition of them, they have many points at which they meet, and they mutually involve views essential to any just or satisfactory dealing with either of them. It is not to be denied, that the perplexities encountered in each of them aggravate the difficulties raised in the other. If an Evangelical scheme appears to controvert or to defy the reasonable conclusions of a fair Philosophy, it must either lose its hold upon the convictions, or look to some other grounds than those furnished by reason for its warrant as a matter of faith. And if Philosophy in any of its critical, scientific, or historical deductions can so weaken the foundations of faith in the records of revelation, as to bring any or all of their contents into doubt, then the Evangelical scheme will no longer have that claim upon our paramount interest that will engage us in the devotional or spiritual study of it which is so quickening now to the zeal and piety of Christian communities. But,

on the other hand, if the Evangelical scheme is so furnished and enforced with overwhelming sanctions as to resist the whole armory of criticism or science, then Philosophy itself must become a docile learner, and must stand before the seated Teacher whose authority of doctrine exceeds that of all other wisdom. The theme opens before us with profound and momentous interest.

Our religious literature, rich as it is in ancient lore on all these religious discussions, is constantly adding to them. They are kept free and fresh to each generation. Our friends and neighbors, the greater and the lesser minds which engage our interest, prove to us that the one or the other of these two methods of religious inquiry enlists all the thought which they give to religion. Let us therefore note the province, the aim, and the fruits of these two methods or purposes of religious inquiry.

The Evangelical spirit in religious inquiry concerns itself with the Christian records, when their authentic, supernatural, and divine authority has been assured, or is taken as established. A communication from God,—that is the title given to the message. Now what does it contain? It contains disclosures concerning the relations subsisting between man and God, as they are changed, rectified, reconciled, by the mediation of Jesus Christ. The aim of mind and heart is to learn precisely what the message communicates as to our own nature and duty and destiny; as to sin, its effects, its penalties, and its remedy; as to the Divine forgiveness, its terms and conditions; as to a future life, its retributions, its woes and joys. The Gospel scheme which is to accomplish such unspeakable results, bringing the greatest of blessings to the world, and offering such a redemption to the individual who can appropriate a share of them to himself, thus becomes the object of a most devout study, of an Evangelical interest. Of course this involves incidentally matters of criticism, of interpretation, of word-wisdom, history, geography, and technical discussions; but these are all *merely* incidental, all subservient to the heart's desire to understand the spiritual significance of the Gospel message. And how differently has this scheme been understood and interpreted Evangelically! That is a poor artifice of bigotry which would appropriate even the word *Evangelical* to a party in the Chris-

tian Church; as if the right of every devout mind to aim for an Evangelical faith depended upon its reaching a forestalled conclusion. As well might the whole language be restricted to a sect, and dictionaries be made the exclusive prerogatives of a presbytery, a convention, or a consociation. The word *Evangelical* is a Christian and not a sectarian word, — it is the baptismal name of our faith, not of one of our parties, — and it covers the spirit and the aim of all those who are revering students of the Gospel and disciples of its truth.

But to what a marvellous variety in conclusions, or results, has the study of the Evangelical scheme been pursued! The very term *scheme*, or *plan*, applied to the Gospel method of salvation, has raised the expectation of some ingenious device, or some complicated, intricate agency involved in it. The controversies of Christians within their own fold have for ages been concerned with the explication of this Evangelical scheme. To some it has presented a most simple, though an august and effective method, intelligible, as its advocates affirm, to every mind, worthy of God and sufficient for man, adapted to every age and clime of the earth, offering no mystery, no perplexity, and expressing its whole conditions in the two commandments of love to God and love to man. From this, the simplest view of the Gospel scheme of salvation, we may pass successively through a scale of different views of it, each having some peculiar element of belief or observance. There is the sacramental element of the creed of Rome, the prelatical element of episcopacy, the metaphysical or enigmatical element of Calvinism, and the lesser denominational elements of different sects. Then various tokens, seals, and observances, such as baptism or immersion, confirmation, confession or absolution, or reception into some visible fold representing the final adjustment of the Great Day, are made to serve as authenticating a personal immunity or a personal security to an individual, in reference to the Gospel scheme. From one or another of these differing elements, of doctrinal divinity, or priestly mediation, or ecclesiastical unity, or denominational policy, a speculative or coöperative efficiency is derived, which is made essential in the exposition and the efficacy of the Gospel scheme of salvation. The main issue,

however, is between that simple view of the scheme which recommends itself to us, and that enigmatical view of it which originated with Augustine, was developed by Calvin, and has been elaborated by a host of theologians ever since. The Gospel scheme of salvation, this is the object of interest to the Evangelical Christian. The attempt is made to appropriate the epithet to that complicated, abstruse, doctrinal system just referred to. As that system is so antagonistic to our own views, — as it bears with it so much of the profession and zeal and piety of Christians, and represents in various modifications the ostensible creed of millions, and has wrought much holy and blessed work, — we must pause upon it.

This complicated, metaphysical view of the Gospel scheme, which would monopolize the epithet Evangelical, regards the New Testament as containing a system of doctrinal divinity which develops a marvellously original, peculiar, and unique theory of the relations between God and man, — a theory which reason could never have devised, and which often shocks or startles reason. Bodies of Divinity, Creeds, Catechisms, and Confessions have for ages elaborated, restated, pruned, and qualified the substance of this doctrinal system. It by no means excludes philosophy. But the philosophy which this system admits is a philosophy all its own, utterly unlike all ancient or modern theories or processes under the name of philosophy, — unlike, too, the philosophy which the disciples of the system practise in their own highest earthly interests, in business, courts of law, or social intercourse. It is maintained that there is a distinctive and eccentric system in Christian divinity, as truly as there is in jurisprudence, or in any branch of physics, — one that is its own, bearing unique and characteristic peculiarities. The facts which this system contemplates are, that there is an existing enmity between men and God, — an enmity not originating with each generation of human offenders, and not reconcilable by a single individual of them on his own part; and that the Gospel has made a reconciliation possible by a method of singular power. The theory is briefly this: — God created our first parents holy and pure, and capable of rendering him due allegiance, and of finding thus a perfect happiness. They acted in behalf of all the millions of millions of

their race. The next incident, appallingly dark to our minds, is this : those two fair creatures, the first of God's human offspring, on whom such almost infinite responsibilities rested, were, in some unexplained way, subjected to the influence of the Devil, who had more power over them for evil, than their blessed Maker had for good. And they fell. The earth's brightest hope sunk in woe. The race of Adam was cursed. His whole posterity, being constructively present with him in the garden of Eden, fell with him, inheriting depravity with its risks and consequences. God in his mercy devised a plan of redemption. He cannot forgive a single sin nor a single sinner, on the simple terms by which Christ requires us, depraved as we are, to forgive. Simple repentance and amendment of life will not meet the conditions of God's violated law, for his offended justice requires redress. He therefore takes upon himself a fleshly form, which, by its connection with his own Divinity, partakes of an infinite efficacy when it is sacrificed on the cross. Faith in that sacrifice *as wrought for just this purpose* works an inward, radical change in the sinner, which, as begun and made effectual through the Spirit, a third co-personality in the Godhead, renders the subject of it a partaker in the virtue of that sacrifice, and thus an heir of immortal bliss, rescued from the eternal penalty of sin. No hope is offered to a single soul except by that process. The infinite love of God is compressed within that one channel to the thoughts and feelings of men. Hell yawns to receive all who fail of it.

Those who have maintained this view of the Gospel scheme, when carrying it into particulars, have raised many dividing issues in the definition of terms and the construction of formulas. But they have agreed essentially in those views of the scheme which give it its distinctive character. As has been already remarked, the scheme has a philosophy of its own. It certainly needs one. This is shown and brought into use to meet the objections which reason offers to the scheme. If at any point the scheme is challenged because it affronts or confounds the instinctive sense of equity or reverence in us, it has answers drawn from this, — its own philosophy. Thus Luther distinctly says : "If God's justice were such that human intelligence might recognize its equity,

it evidently would not be Divine justice, and would not be one whit different from human justice."* Two sorts of justice! This is certainly increasing, instead of relieving, the burden on human reason. So, whenever human reason, to which revelation must, of course, make its first appeal, encounters and staggers at any obstacle in this scheme, the difficulty is turned by a phrase: as Edwards uses the phrases, "the Sovereign Power," or "the unsearchable counsel of God," to silence the objector. "God's glory," he says, "is an ultimate end of the Creator." "God manifests a supreme and ultimate regard to himself in all his works." Quite a different sort of writer—the sentimental Hervey, he of the "Meditations"—says: "To the making of a world there was no obstacle; but to the saving of man there seemed to be insurmountable bars. Who can suggest a method to absolve the traitorous race, yet vindicate the honors of Almighty Sovereignty? This is an intricacy which the most exalted of finite intelligences are unable to clear."† If we say that the scheme seems to us to dictate to God the terms within which alone he can exercise even his prerogative of mercy, we are told that Scripture, by implication, defines those terms in its revelation of the attributes of God.

The confident assurance of many of the advocates of this system claims for it an effective and irresistible power, as having the full warrant of the Gospel, and the triumphant tests of much personal experience; that, while it reveals the wisdom of God, it has also proved the power of God unto salvation. But at every point the system is assailable by the most honest arguments and objections, and not the least so in its appeals to experimental proofs. How many it has wholly alienated from the Gospel, hardened in sin, given over to despair, or confounded and perplexed, in the most earnestly sincere efforts which men and women can make for peace with God, God alone knows. How many, not of the reckless, the earth-bound, or the undevout, but of those whose purity of spirit and intensity of conscience have marked them as God's elect on the earth,—how many of the meek, the sincere, and the pious,—have failed to find

* Op. II. Wittemberg, 485.

† Contemplations of the Starry Heavens.

in that system either a key to the Bible, or a heavenly message to their own hearts! What multitudes of earnest seekers after peace with God have been driven to despair by that scheme! Its advocates have often numbered its adherents, but do they ever number those whom it fails to win? After all the excitement and machinery of a revival, one may count, perhaps, a score of converts, and the preacher rejoices over them. But what will he say of the hundreds who have been utterly unconvinced by his appeals, many of whom are made to doubt the sincerity and the reasonableness of all religion? He knows that his converts, so far as the keenest scrutiny of man can judge, are not one whit superior, by any moral or religious distinction, to an equal number of persons among those unconvinced by his distinctive views. Those who have been subjected to the appeals and the influence of this system are millions in each generation, its converts are only thousands; many of these have needed a reconversion, and many have then fallen away, making shipwreck of faith, if not also of a good conscience.

For several reasons, which might be mentioned, we must refuse to regard each adherent and disciple of this system as an independent voucher for its Scriptural or its experimental character. There is scarce any other form of speculative belief, scarce any other religious system in Christendom, which owes more than does this of Calvinism to all those dogmatic, contagious, and sympathetic influences which are so skilfully and so effectively used alike by its most powerful and by its weakest advocates, notwithstanding the constant assertion, that the system recognizes the freest Protestantism and the fullest liberty of private judgment. Indeed, in our own minds, we restrict the number of the real disciples of Calvinism to the circle of its clerical or its scholastic advocates. We regard its laical testimonies as but few, and as of but doubtful value. Our own personal acquaintance with individuals in full communion with Calvinism assures us that the opinions which they nominally hold often find their warrant, not so much in independent inquiry and conviction, as in an authoritative or sympathetic influence which has been gained over their minds or feelings by others. Each new convert, in passing through

the technical "experience" of Calvinism, is continually told how others have felt, and how he ought to feel; and therefore it is not strange that he should think he has the same feelings, nor strange that he even should have them.

The alleged belief of great companies of persons in any set of doctrinal propositions is a thing to be doubted. We very often hear reference made to "the faith in which our Puritan fathers lived and died"; as if that faith were indicated by a fixed standard, the exact quantity, quality, and substance of it being ascertainable as a matter of fact. The reference to such a "faith" may be allowed for some general purposes, and a superficial knowledge of past history may not dispose one to bring it into question. But if the matter is looked into with a scrutinizing eye, it will be found that our fathers had no such perfect amity and accordance in their faith. The fact, that the first two colleague ministers of the First Church in Boston each prepared a rival catechism for the children of the flock, and took a different side in that bitter controversy on Antinomianism which was opened before they had been ten years on this soil, is a fair index to the character of all our ecclesiastical history. The doctrinal tenets which were thought to constitute the very life of religion were held in such a way among our fathers, that each divine of a strong and independent mind was constantly working upon them as if for his own better satisfaction. If he was moved to write upon them, he was sure to introduce some qualifications or abatements of them, availing himself to the utmost of the little liberty left to him within the creed. For this he was equally sure to be taken in hand by some zealous champion. So a strife was opened, and each partisan was supported by more or less of the laity, who were thus proved to be in such a state of mind as indicated a want of complete satisfaction, a readiness for discussion, and a desire to avail themselves of every thing that might promise to soften or humanize their creed. A faithful history of the ancient religious institutions of New England is yet to be written, from the abundant materials for it in church records, proceedings of councils, interleaved almanacs, pamphlet controversies, diaries, letters, and town registers. These will be found to be but too faithful witnesses

to all the passions and infirmities whose workings they portray. They will show that each of our older churches has its discreditable story, incident to some issue raised by its objectionable or ineffective theology. The attempts to "starve out" too rigid or too liberal ministers, the packing of "councils," the trials of heretics, the thankless efforts to awaken the "ungodly," the scarcely more successful efforts to keep alive the "first love" of the "godly," the lamentations over the "decline of piety," which are found to be all the more earnest the farther back we trace them, and therefore to have been the most intense at the very date which is assigned for the golden age of "the faith";—these tokens, together with the steady increase in every congregation of the number of those who became utterly hardened, indifferent, unbelieving, or desirous of some more Scriptural and practical dispensation of religion, will reveal some facts which bear hard upon the experimental boasts of Calvinism.

To our minds, one of the most vulnerable points which Calvinism offers, in view of its appeal to experience, is found in the languid, the unrealizing, and evidently distrustful spirit in which its dreadful tenets are held by those who profess them. How few of its disciples actually face its appalling doctrines, and have the nerve to apply them in the actual intercourse of life! How few seem to realize their terrific operation, *if they are true!* Humane men and women, who would rush out of their dwellings with the courage and sympathy which real distress awakens, if they heard that a neighbor's house was on fire, and only one single *body* was in danger of perishing in the flames, will meet the inmates of that dwelling in the quiet and pleasant courtesies of daily life, while *professing to believe* that their *souls* are destined to everlasting burnings. Pillars of Calvinistic churches, whose creed assures them that the heathen can be saved only through the labors of missionaries, will spend a thousand dollars on some personal luxuries and contribute ten dollars to the Mission treasury. Parents who regard each new-born child as, *theoretically*, an heir of Divine wrath, are not thereby withheld from bringing into existence a whole family of children,—not, certainly, as offerings to Moloch, but in dreadful uncertainty as to whether they shall be the subjects of the renewing grace of God,

or be for ever separated from them in the retributions of the last day. And whenever a disciple of Calvinism, moved by the irresistible yearnings of affection toward a friend, or by the manifest evidence of true piety in a neighbor who denies and withstands his own creed, attempts to relax the severity of that creed towards him, the inconsistency of his course is very apparent, though it is of an amiable character. Some Calvinists, when asked what is to become of their unbelieving friends and companions, who are their equals at least in all Christian excellence, are evidently in a dilemma. Their doom is an awful one, according to the theory, for even their "righteousness" only deepens their guilt. Any hope which may be indulged concerning them is so far destructive, utterly destructive, to the theory of Calvinism. It is as if Noah had taken pity on all his friends and neighbors, as he floated by them on the rising waters, and had lifted them one by one into the ark. Either the ark would have sunk overloaded from the incapacity of its dimensions, as designed only for the rescue of one family from the whole population of the globe; or if a miraculous power imparted to the ark had enabled it to float with all whom pity might invite into it, then the result would have been more directly gained by the omission of the flood.

If there be such a marked, distinctive, and divine peculiarity in this system as isolates it from all the theories and processes of which reason is judge, it might seem that one who had accepted this system, and been acclimated and indoctrinated, body and soul, by it, would enjoy an inward, unwavering assurance, an almost magical defence, against distrust or a falling away. But so it has not proved. The confessions made by some of the most eminent and honored defenders of this system, in their diaries and correspondence, show that they have by no means found a constant or a complete peace in their experimental test of that process by which reconciliation to God was theoretically assured to them. What mournful confessions are those in the diary of the eminent Dr. Payson! The uncertainty and anxiety as to whether one has partaken of the grace of God through that doctrinal scheme, have continually obtruded themselves in moments when a sweet assurance was most needed. The

human heart has seldom found an unbroken rest in a theory so complicated, so unlike to all other mental processes, so involved with risks of self-delusion and heart-blindness. That same Satan, about whose first agency in human woe there is such a dark and appalling mystery, seems to follow up his antagonism to God in the believer's heart. For some of the disciples of this scheme have sadly affirmed, that even Satan might cunningly suggest to a reprobate the delusive conviction that he was one of the elect, while at the very time he was damned; and that God might prostrate the best-grounded hope of salvation by withdrawing his face. The depressing misgivings of some of the saints of this school of divinity have proved that their warmest and most rejoicing confidence might yield to the most appalling despair.

Who can fail to observe, in reading the Memoir and Letters of the excellent John Foster, the tokens of a depressing melancholy, not wholly to be ascribed to his temperament, but deepened, if not generated, by his *creed*. We see a sad, introspective self-examination, a gloomy view of the interests even of his own most cherished friends, a desponding tone, a painful struggling against the inferences plainly following from his doctrinal scheme. The small number of the elect, — of those who even wished to avail themselves of the Gospel remedy; the dread and unutterable significance of the doctrine of the eternal torment of the unsanctified in this life; — how did Foster brood over those dreary thoughts! Observe, too, his remarks upon the motives addressed in the common appeals in behalf of missions to the heathen. Those appeals, says Foster, assert that God has made "the salvation or perdition of undefined millions of our race" to depend upon the will of man to carry to them the Gospel. That is, the destiny of millions of the children of God is decided, not by any attribute of the Heavenly Father, not even by their own use of the light which they have, but by the contents of a contribution-box at a monthly concert for missions!

There is, indeed, a deep melancholy diffused over Foster's writings. The pure, gentle spirit of the man seems to have been steeped in sadness, because, while the scheme of his theology engaged his every emotion, thought, and interest, his human heart struggled intensely

against its painful application to his fellow-creatures. He could not, like Dr. Samuel Hopkins, resolve the eternal agonies of the reprobate into a manifestation of the love of God, — a most sweet, serene, and holy token of Divine justice. The word *pensive* will be found to be of constant, even of wearisome recurrence in the Letters of John Foster. The word and the feeling were distilled out of his heart by his creed. It may be, too, that his own "Essay upon the Aversion of Men of Taste to Evangelical Religion" would have been brightened in its views, had he really met the problem in this form: Why are literary and cultivated men averse to my views of religion, seeing that all the gems of our Christian literature have been produced or are cherished by this same class of persons?

Justice Coleridge bade his friend, Dr. Arnold of Rugby, when troubled by doubts of this doctrinal system, "to pause in his inquiries, to pray earnestly for help and light from above, and turn himself more strongly than ever to the practical duties of a holy life." And another friend of the doubter writes: Arnold "scruples doing what I advise him, which is, to put down the objections [to the Trinity] by main force, whenever they arise in his mind, fearful that in so doing he shall be violating his conscience for a maintenance."*

How much evidence would our religious literature and the searchings of Christian hearts afford us of the same sad fruits, misgivings, and dreads, as arising from the Augustinian or Calvinistic interpretations of the Evangelical scheme! We once heard a venerable Christian woman of ninety years, and for more than half a century a most estimable member of a Baptist church, express herself thus. She rose to speak a farewell in a last interview, holding in her hand the Bible, which, as her whole library, she had read over and over with a sweet fidelity of piety. Questions of philosophy, of criticism, of science, of miracles, were nothing to her; they had never entered her mind, nor given her a cause of doubt. It was the Gospel scheme of salvation for which she had been searching by her humble fireside, for long years, and she spoke at this parting the result. Using the least positive, the humblest, meekest, and most hesitating tone,

* Stanley's *Life of Arnold*, Amer. ed., pp. 24, 25.

as if she feared that a too confident word might turn her faint hope into a boast, and so destroy it, she said: "I think, if I am not deceived, if I am not deluded, that I may feel as if I had a reasonable hope." Poor, faint-hearted Christian! How complicated and obscure must have been, to thy meek confidence in man's schemes, the revelation of God's love through Christ! Did he, the Master, make the method of forgiveness and assurance so dark a problem to the women of Israel, whose sins he pardoned for their love, and whose trust he appointed to be commemorated for ever in the preaching of his Gospel? It may be said, however, that that humble hope took in so glorious a prospect, that even the faintest vision of it was a joy more than sufficient to crown a long Christian life. Very true. But when we consider that the alternative of that hope was the prospect of everlasting burnings, that hesitating confidence must have been a burden to the spirit.

And this leads to brief remark upon the use to which the Scriptures are turned in the exposition or the defence of this complicated view of the Evangelical scheme. In general, the Gospels are but little used in its statement or support. The Sermon on the Mount and the Parables of the Saviour, so direct in their lessons of practical righteousness, are overlooked for the sake of the Epistles, and for the technical terms in which St. Paul expresses his own personal experience and controversies. Among one thousand nine hundred and twenty-four printed sermons of John Calvin, not a single one has a text from either of the Gospels. How ingeniously and perversely, in our view, are certain Scripture texts employed for this scheme, in defiance of grammar, reason, history, and the rules of language; and how tenaciously do many of its advocates cling to words and phrases in the sense which perverted constructions and associations have gathered around them! Sentences from the Book of Job which his tormentors spoke rashly, and which are silenced in the reply of the sufferer, are alleged as the very utterances of God on the guilt of human nature. The great revival text, "What must I do to be saved?" is taken from the mouth of a pagan turnkey, as if all at once, by an intuitive flash of thought, he had divined the whole scheme of doctrinal divinity, and had reached that

stage of compunctious experience which is now called *conviction*. How perversely is that text construed which reads, "Without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sin"; and that text which reads, "Jesus thought it not robbery to be equal with God"; — a construction utterly inconsistent with the argument of Paul, who is asserting the Saviour's humility, — a grace which would be strikingly denied in his claiming an equality with God, "who put all things under him." The words, "Great is the mystery of godliness," are used as if *godliness*, instead of meaning holiness of life, or piety, meant the triple constitution of the Divine co-personality. Indeed, this system fails to explain more than one half of the Bible in consistency with its own terms, and leaves us to ask unanswered a host of questions fairly involved in its conditions. If the fact that man sins can be accounted for only by supposing that he was born with a depraved nature, how are we to account for Adam's sinning when he was created with a holy nature? But if sin in Adam can be accounted for without supposing his nature to have had an original taint, why may not sin in us be accounted for without referring it to an inborn depravity? If Adam had been a father before his fall, would a son of his have perpetuated a pure race on this earth? How were the pure and good of ancient days made partakers of the grace of God, if only the vicarious death of Christ could win God's mercy? The whole science of moral philosophy is distracted with inextricable confusion by this view of human nature. Hobbes and Mandeville alone could profit by it. Professor Whewell tells us, that, when the distinctive principles of Christianity were first introduced into the systems of moral philosophy in England, the tenet of man's corruption by nature "was put in a strong point of view, when it was held that he was so perverted as not only not to be able to *do*, but not able even to *know* what was good."*

We may not speak with contempt or levity of this view of the Evangelical scheme. It has had noble and heroic champions, pious and devoted witnesses, meek and faithful disciples. The love and service of some of the purest of our race have been given to it. Men richly endowed by God, men refined and sanctified by highest

* History of Moral Philosophy in England, p. 58.

culture, men of scholarship, of gravity and piety and all other gifts and graces, with women the elect of their devouter sex, the lofty and the humble, the ignorant and the wise, the gracious and the stern, have given to this scheme of doctrine their whole heart's zeal and love and confidence. It has wrought great works in the world. John Eliot, the saintly disciple in the wilderness, toiled to match the dread doctrines of Calvin with the endless gutturals of the Delaware tongue, and Samuel Hopkins succeeded in grinding up the granite quarries of the Divine Decrees into a digestible pap which has grown into the muscles of New England theology, so called.

No! we may not speak contemptuously of the system. Yet we cannot believe that, as the explication of the Evangelical scheme, it is authenticated either by its substantial elements, or by its experimental proofs, or by the warrant of Scripture. The system is bold, inhuman, relentless, and unreasonable. It begins by forcing even God into a dilemma, and by representing his moral government as in an emergency, — not to say a quandary. It denies the existence in human nature of any thing that can serve as the basis of a self-recuperative religious effort; and it leaves the assurance of Divine grace on which the heart might rely subject to painful apprehension even in the elect. The scheme is burdened with paradoxes, requiring wisdom to be regarded as folly, — not in the sense of St. Paul, — and announcing to us the judgments of a Divine law on our disabled nature, and invoking upon us the estranging wrath of a loving Father. Man, great in his origin and in some surviving element of his being, and capable through some transmuting process of a destiny of unspeakable grandeur, is, nevertheless, an archangel ruined. A little child who is not expected to know any thing until he is taught, and with whom we are satisfied if he learns spelling, reading, and writing, after patient effort, and the use of means, is expected to come into the world full furnished by instinct with a knowledge of the holy law of God, of the highest motives of duty, and heartily disposed to perform it. And if the weak little creature in the cradle has not that Divine knowledge by nature, without painful learning, then he is pronounced a young fiend and doomed to woe. The scheme of doctrine is called a "humbling"

one, and yet it ministers to a pride in many of the elect, than which all the exhibitions of vanity and conceit can offer nothing more odious and self-elated. The doctrines themselves are called "doctrines of grace." But if the grace of God were restricted in this life within the narrow limits by which it is doctrinally bounded for another life, existence in this world would be intolerable to the vast majority of human beings. The dreamy philosopher Whichcote, while wandering in an abstract mood through the streets of Cambridge, saw two boys fighting; running to separate them, he cried out in amazement, "What! moral entities, and yet pugnacious?" Poor human nature! Dark as is its problem, Calvinism does not lighten it, nor throw any thing but the shadow of the Scriptures across it.

Let us turn now to a simpler view of the Evangelical scheme. This finds in the Gospel scheme no declared inability in man to do his duty, no implication of a child in the guilt of a father, no obstacle in one attribute of God to the exercise of another attribute of God. It recognizes a simple but most august basis of a true religion in the law of right living before man and God. It rests upon such plain precepts as are found in the Sermon on the Mount, in the two great commandments, in the sublime announcement by which Gentiles were first invited into the Christian fold: "God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation, he that feareth Him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with Him." This scheme will meet the force of each illustrative parable of the Saviour; that of the seed sown; that of the laborers in the vineyard; that of the talents; that of the pearl of great price; that of building on a rocky foundation; and that precious and beautiful parable which is a deadly arrow in the vitals of Calvinism, the parable of the Prodigal Son. This is the scheme, which, simple as it is, was a mystery hid from ages; which prophets and kings failed to conceive; into which even the angels in vain desired to look; for its simplicity baffled them, — a simplicity such as belongs only to a work of God, who was not driven into an emergency, but working out a long plan. There is nothing mystical, nothing magical, nothing metaphysical, nothing enigmatical, in this scheme. It takes the epithet *Father*, applied to God; the epithet

child of God, applied to man; and the epithet *Mediator*, applied to Christ. Here are the three parties in this simple Gospel scheme. Sin, repentance, salvation, are the themes involved in this mediation. Love and faith are the agencies for rectifying the relations of child and father. Jesus Christ has the revering trust, the devout and obedient homage of the heart, that enters into the power of his life and of his cross. Judgment is for the deeds done in the body, not for a nature wrecked in Eden. Man, not God, is the party to be reconciled, and Christ's death appeals to us, not to the dread sovereignty of the Almighty.

When it is objected, that, if this be the substance of the Gospel scheme, it is but a republication of the religion of nature, — we may reply, that the religion of nature is just what is needed; what all the world needs and groans for; the only kind of religion which all the world can receive, understand, and obey; the very religion of the soul, of practical duty, of a revering and obedient life. Any attempt to make the Gospel message something different from this, will at once deprive it of the very element of its universality and power. Piety and righteousness will never rise to their true regard among human beings, till it is believed to have been worthy of God to have made a special revelation, — the hope and the joy of man, — solely to announce their paramount claims. That the simple law of moral rectitude be estimated at its own vital value, we must regard it as addressing itself to man only with a most fitting display of its august majesty, when attended with all the array of prophecy and miracle, of inspiration, and of the sacrifice on Calvary. If the wisest of heathen sages could cause his name to float down on the stream of time by having spoken the words, "From heaven came the counsel, 'Man, know thyself'"; it is enough for the everlasting memorial of the Saviour, that he said, "This is life eternal, to know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent!"

Celsus, the first of the philosophical enemies of the Gospel, said: "He must be void of understanding who can believe that Greeks and barbarians, in Asia, Europe, and Libya, all nations to the ends of the earth, can unite in the reception of one and the same religious doctrine."

Now this is the very result at which the Gospel aims, and which it will yet accomplish. But will the result be attained through a metaphysical, enigmatical system of doctrinal theology, or through a religion of practical duty? How different an idea of religion does one receive from the parables of the Saviour, with their persuasive morals, and from the technicalities of the Epistles, with all their controversial incrustations!

So simple is this other view of the Evangelical scheme. The simplicity of it is its offence. But does not its very simplicity, in going to the root of the matter, and in offering a view of religion as practical duty and piety which can be preached, approved, and practised in every clime of the earth, in the islands of the seas, and by all people, — does not this simplicity commend the scheme as worthy of God; as a seemingly weak thing, which can confound the mighty; as the wisdom of God, and the power of God unto salvation? Why turn away from this “simplicity that is in Christ,” to torture out an intricate, metaphysical, or mystical scheme? If any secret, spiritual, inexplicable processes of the inner being, or any relations of peculiar heart-reverence and sympathy and trust towards Jesus Christ, are needed to make the Gospel effective for salvation, they are MEANS. They are requisite, of vital necessity. These and many more such sentiments and emotions and exercises are requisite as helping influences, but righteousness of heart and life is the end. There may indeed be room for much difference of opinion as to the place which Christ is to hold in this view of the Evangelical system, — as to the nature and conditions of faith in him, as to his present agency in his Church, and as to his place in the believer’s heart relatively to the place which he himself assigns to God in that heart. It is obvious that these questions are in part decided in one way for all who adopt this view of the Gospel, and that, in so far as they are not thus decided, they must be left open to the varieties of sentiment, susceptibility, and sympathetic tenderness in the temperament of each disciple. We are constrained, however, to insist that this individuality of decision rests wholly with temperament, and is not a matter of the logical intellect. Some persons love a definite, close, and sharply distinguished view of the nature of Christ,

and will admit no conception which is not thus clearly defined. Others love to lose themselves in the reveries of mystery and mysticism in all such matters. But the intellectual view of Christ which characterizes this system may consist with a sentiment concerning him which shall have either the coolness of a philosophic stoicism, or the tender pietism of the Moravians.

These two extreme views of the Evangelical scheme furnish the themes of earnest religious interest, as well as of exciting controversy, among believers, who are thus all Evangelical Christians. The intense zeal which students, thinkers, and leaders of thought show in verifying and sounding the great issues thus opened, is evidence that they have got hold of something which is kindred to all the truth of the universe. Whether the path to the central truth is through a perplexing labyrinth, or by a straight way on, is the question debated. Meanwhile the strong point of the one scheme answers, as usual, to the weak point of the other scheme. In the exercise of that candor which gives more strength to a conviction than any contempt of adversaries will afford, we will seek to strengthen our own weakness by acknowledging and imitating the piety that is not our own.

We pass now to the Philosophical treatment of our religion. While the interest of all equally confiding believers in the Christian revelation is thus engaged in finding and availing themselves of the Gospel method of salvation, there is another class who are applying the tests of criticism and speculation and science to the records, the substance, the elemental principles, the evidences, operations, and results of the Christian religion. The Gospel is thus subjected to a searching and keen-eyed scrutiny, both as to its source and its message. It is brought to the bar of a judicial trial; is examined and cross-examined through its witnesses; its unsupported assertions are disputed; it is required to answer questions which it refuses to answer; it is visited with the dimming distrust which antiquity gathers around all venerable things. There is no ingredient in the whole composition of the Gospel or its records, there is no elemental or composite fact wrought into its doctrine or history, which this searching, unsparing Philosophy does

not bring under discussion. Even the existence, or the personality, or the intelligence, or the communicativeness of that Divine Source to which the Gospel is referred, is questioned with equal freedom with the claim of inspiration for the record itself. Or, if God is taken by the Philosophical critic to be an admitted fact in the universe, then he is confronted with the method alleged to have been chosen by him for revealing his will through a book; while his right to work miracles, and his ability to prove that he has wrought them, are debated as freely as men and women discuss each other's talents, characters, actions, and property. If this trial of the Gospel by the tests of Philosophy could show itself in a visible form, we should see physics and metaphysics, geology and mesmerism, astronomy and chronology, archæology and mythology, the ghosts of old Egypt and the winged bulls of Nineveh, Spinozism and Hegelianism, science and history, and, in addition, "The Soul, with its Sorrows and Aspirations," each and all levelling their spears, and seeking to find a vital part in the Gospel at which they may aim. The trial is severe, the conflict is earnest; the issue at stake, what mortal man can weigh or measure, in any words which estimate the interests of this world?

The relations between the Evangelical and the Philosophical modes of dealing with our religion are sufficiently stated or implied in the definition of their separate aims. These two processes open every theme of thought which religion has ever opened to men, and keep them before our minds with a fresh, if not a novel interest. They embrace all that is profound, exciting, and perplexing to human thought. They suspend the religious convictions and hopes of our race. We may indeed doubt whether the sphere of modern thought is really so much enlarged as we assume it to be; but it seems as if it were, and in that seeming lie new trials and risks. A distrust of the evidence of miracles, and an excessive desire for it, may often originate in and attach to precisely the same state of mind, as a careful analysis will prove. The very same Thomas, whose faith in the recognition of the features of his Master needed a miraculous token to assure it, would, if he were living now, and had seen no such token, be the most earnest arguer for the insufficiency or the impossibility of a miracle.

Indeed, there has been as much that is *irrational* in the speculations of the rationalists themselves, as can be found in some of the most amazing superstitions that have ever had prevalence.

To adjust the relations between these two great themes of all religious interest, is a task for the good and wise who are yet to be born. There is an intense and unsparing persistency of purpose in the trial of the Gospel by modern sceptics. The trial is all the more vigorously pursued, because it is instituted by those who have gained skill in debating the Evangelical question. The Evangelical and the Philosophical parties have indeed many points of common interest; but points at which they meet only to diverge again. Thus, both parties are equally interested in the earliest ages and the most remote antiquities of the Church; but it is because the one party wishes to learn what the Gospel scheme of salvation was then understood to be; and because the other party would look to the very sources of the religion to detect fact or fable. Heathens and heathenism equally engage the interest of both parties. But while the one party wishes to decide the relations of the heathen to the Gospel scheme, or to rescue them from the pit, the other party hopes to find in the traditions and rites of heathenism the glimmerings of a once entire and universal faith. A grim idol is to one party a shocking token of the darkest debasement of the soul; to the other party it is a pet, an oracle of fond respect.

We are left to mediate between these two parties in Christendom, to heed them both, and to study all their open questions. Do the controversies involved in the discussion of the Evangelical scheme connect themselves with the trial-tests of the critical, the speculative, the sceptical Philosophy? Do the perplexities of the one class of questions promise to yield by the clearing up of those in the other class of questions? Will the old distinction between the internal and the external evidences come to our aid, so that the inner truth shall fortify the outer framework which incloses it? We may depend upon it, that the Christian faith cannot traverse all climes and ages, and find a universal prevalence, and work its highest mission, if it is burdened with an antagonism to science and history and philosophy, and with

an antagonism to the reason and natural sentiments and best thoughts of well-meaning men. We must abate its metaphysical perplexities, and relieve its philosophical difficulties, before we can bid it rule the world.

While it would not be just to charge upon the Calvinistic view of the Evangelical scheme the burden of exciting, through its own perplexity and repulsiveness, all the scepticism which, under the name and style of Philosophy, has attacked the foundations of Christian faith, it is but fair to say, that scepticism has been made hearty, stern, and resolute in its scrutiny, because embittered by the severity of a prevailing doctrinal creed. Distrustfulness of the truth of revelation has often first made itself felt in hearts and minds that have been grappling with the dark problems offered to them in the Augustinian or Calvinistic theology. If now the simple view of the Gospel scheme, as requiring righteousness of life for its great condition, process, and end, and making small account of doctrinal speculations, — if this scheme should be found to win the general accord of Christians, — the sceptic may be more willing or more able to discern in such a religion reasons for identifying its revelations with a God, with the attributes of God, with a point of time in the world's history, and with miracles and inspiration as its natural evidences. Will any other than the simplest, the least perplexed and intricate, any other than the most practical view of the Gospel, be able to stand all the tests which doubt and philosophy can bring to bear upon it? Can we meet a caviller of any kind with dogmatics, so well as with pure, august, and practical truth, — that which has an answering echo to it in his own heart, conscience, and life? A religion for this life is what is now felt to be needed. Time was when, under some exhibitions of religion, individuals here and there were driven almost into frenzy to secure their own personal election, as if the whole problem of the universe was involved in their single rescue from the appalling fate of the lost, just as the most timid and selfish snatch at the boat in a shipwreck. But this has ceased to be the absorbing religious interest of the most generous minds. All the reforming efforts of the present age have tended to bring Christianity to a trial; to prove whether

its strength lies in practical righteousness, and tends to secure *that*; to decide whether it has an operating energy to move and rectify the world, or is only the solace of individual minds and hearts, assuring them of their personal escape from the future doom of the multitude of our race.

How arduous and responsible does the office of a religious teacher become, in view of all the questions and controversies thus opened! The whole philosophy of heaven and of earth is thrown into the public streets. Themes which in ancient days were faintly intimated in whispers, with finger pressed on lip, in token either of reverence for God or fear of man, are now the very staple of common discussion. The only hiding-place of faith is out of doors. Men have taken literally the Scripture rhetoric, "I said ye men are gods"; and some reply, "Yes, and there is no God elsewhere than on the earth." The open agitation of all the issues raised by the discussion of the themes we have referred to greatly complicates the task of Christian preachers and expositors. The question frequently before the mind of the minister is, Shall I yield to a devotional or a philosophical strain? Shall I take faith in the Scriptures as assured, and appeal, and warn, and exhort, and console from them? or shall I labor to commend them, not only to the conscience, but to the sceptical mind? Shall I preach as to believers or to unbelievers? That our congregations contain some of both these classes, and that the ministers know it, and are somewhat embarrassed as to the style of preaching that is most needed, is perhaps one reason of the inefficacy of preaching.

It is advised, by many persons, that ministers should reintroduce expository lectures on the Bible for an afternoon service. But how immense is the field that would thus be opened for discussion, and how questionable as to edification in the dealing with it! When Robinson and Hunter and Doddridge pursued that course, they took the Bible just as it stands, assured and unquestioned by any of the assaults of an undermining criticism, and they sought to interpret it solely for instructive and devotional uses. Now an expounder in one of our societies would need to divide his attention between the religious improvement of what is plainly or obscurely

written, and such perplexing matters as the cosmogony of Moses, or the harmonizing of Kings and Chronicles, or the theory of myths, or the philosophical authentication of miracles.

But it may not be, that, just as our Bible societies are multiplying by millions the precious book, it should be discovered to be filled with worthless legends. No reach of philosophical effrontery will ever persuade the world of that; for the world is too old and too wise in the experience of its own ignorance to believe that. It may not be, that, when a dangerous civilization is most making us feel the need of a pure and operative religion, it should be discovered that there is no passage-way through the dome of heaven for light and truth and hope to come to us, and none to come if there was. It may not be, that, when the mind of man is just feeling the glow of its own inspiration, it should discover that there is no more of inspiration in the universe than what has been breathed into our poor clay. No! God will not leave wholly uncheered any deep desire or necessity which he has communicated to the soul of man. The philosophizing spirit, when it has indulged the exercise of its utmost freedom, and, without any restraint from fear or authority, has pursued its own course, in questioning every ground and tenet of human belief, wearies itself at last. Finding that every thing may be doubted, it soon inclines to the search after any thing that may be believed. The heart comes to the relief of the head; the spirit claims back what the mind had surrendered. The ear hears a voice behind it. Too far behind that backward voice has sounded to some, who, in seeking relief from blank scepticism, have not been satisfied with Gospel truth save with a Papal indorsement. After the utmost exercise of the freedom of doubt, men find that there is a real pleasure in the freedom of belief. It is not strange that some should feel that they cannot exercise too much of it. God be praised that we have hearts, as well as heads; affections and hopes, as well as brains. The Gospel faith is always sure of one element in the make of every human being who has heard of it. Coleridge says of himself, at one period of his life, that his head was with Spinoza, but his heart was with St. Paul and St. John. Spinoza is welcome to his share in that par-

tition; while we gladly hear again the echo of the words of the two disciples after the evening walk to Emmaus, "Did not our hearts burn within us, as he talked with us by the way and opened to us the Scriptures?"

If there is to be always such an issue between the heart and the head, we must learn to meet their conflicts with a large and generous tolerance of mind. Religion, doubtless, will always be to man the most perplexing, as well as the most momentous of themes. Its range of truths is infinite. Some of them are as plain as axioms; some of them as fathomless as the infinite abysses of space. We begin our learning with the simplest precepts of religion; we grow to the meditation of its profoundest mysteries. In this rising of its truths from the plain to the profound, there is a resemblance between religion and the use made of the letters of our alphabet, of which *a, b, c*, the first three, express the learning of the child in the nursery; while *x, y, z*, the last three, are used to denote the unknown quantities in the problems which the astronomer studies beneath the eye of all heaven. We must not forget, however, that all these letters, employed with ordinary intelligence, are promiscuously used in the common affairs of life. And so it is, that it is neither the axioms nor the perplexities of religion, but a combination of all its lessons, that makes the best furniture for heart and mind.

While Christian scholars and thinkers debate these lofty themes, they must practise mutual tolerance. The bitterness of sectarian warfare must yield to the united zeal of all Christian minds, to withstand the assaults of honest scepticism, and the contempt of the worldly and indifferent. True, there is something in religious differences which seems to goad the intensity of strong feeling more than there is even in political differences. There should, however, be something more exalting, too, in disputes which reach above the things of earth. The connection of a religious sentiment with any debated issue ought always to elevate the strife. The issue opened between Jews and Samaritans, as to the rival summits of Gerizim and Moriah, touched a matter of devotion; and so the sentiment of the dispute was wholly different from that of the Roman rivalry between the Palatine and the Aventine. Those who are engaged in

rearing the Temple of Truth should feel that they have a purpose in view unlike to that which moved the builders of the Tower of Babel, and they should not hazard by their contentions the sad result which befell that structure. A quarrelsome, contentious Christian breaks the great net of the Gospel which holds us all; and he is himself more likely to fall through the rent which he opens, than is any one else.

And as to the authority and religious use of the Bible, of the words of Prophets and Apostles, the instincts of the soul must be our best interpreters. No book or writing can be fairly interpreted but from the same point of view from which it was written. The point of view from which the Bible was written was not a scientific one, nor a philosophical one. The outlook of every sentence, line, phrase, and sentiment in that holy book, is that of the eye of the heart, turned in humility, devotion, and longing desire to God; and Jesus Christ is the medium through which all the rays of light are gathered into focal brightness, and the images of all sacred things are transferred to the heart of man. Amid all the strifes and discussions which engage our minds, devotion, spirituality of feeling, Christian piety, present their claims to a supreme regard. To keep that fervent spirit alive should be the preëminent aim of every party, and of every individual to whom religion offers a single theme of interest or of thought.

G. E. E.

ART. VI.—GRAY'S ADDRESSES.*

THE volume whose title we give below, published at the request of the teachers in the Bulfinch Street Sunday School, contains a collection of addresses delivered at various times during their author's ministry, principally on Sunday School Instruction, and on Pauperism. These are subjects upon which no one is more competent to

* *Sunday School and other Addresses.* By FREDERICK T. GRAY, Pastor of the Bulfinch Street Church. Boston: Benjamin H. Greene; Crosby, Nichols, & Co. 1852. 16mo. pp. 224.

speak than Mr. Gray. He has had great and varied experience; he was one of the first to see the importance of Sunday schools, and for some twelve or fifteen years he was one of the Ministers at Large. As the natural consequence of knowledge thus acquired, the views which he presents are everywhere remarkable for the practical character which they assume. He is one who never speculates for speculation's sake, but only for action. In regard to the matter of which he treats, it would seem as if two questions were always in his mind. First, What can be done? and secondly, How can it be done?

Not the least valuable part of the volume is that which gives an account of the origin of the Ministry at Large and of the Sunday schools connected with our denomination in the city of Boston. In regard to both, Mr. Gray speaks from personal knowledge, and the Addresses before us contain facts of great interest, which, but for some such record, would soon be lost.

The younger portion of the community can hardly understand the change which has taken place in public opinion during the last thirty years respecting Sunday schools, and, still more, respecting the true mode of dealing with pauperism. At the beginning of this period the system of Sunday-school instruction was very generally looked upon with doubtful favor, while scarcely any method of aiding the poor was thought of, beyond the mere supplying of their bodily wants. These facts must be remembered, if we would form a just estimate of the labors which have been devoted to these subjects.

Mr. Gray's volume suggests many tempting topics for remark. But we shall confine ourselves to a brief account of the origin and growth of the Ministry at Large, as that is likely to be of particular interest to our readers. There is something to us extremely interesting in its unpretending, simple, and healthy commencement and early progress. But more than this, — its history furnishes an admirable illustration of how much can be done without any special aids or advantages, by a persevering, judicious, and disinterested devotion to a single good object, while, at the same time, it affords an example for the encouragement of those whose benevolent labors are hindered by obstacles, or are rewarded by little immediate success. In these days of impatience and change, when every

year witnesses the birth of some new enterprise heralded by loud proclamations, and introduced to the world by speeches and public meetings, and all the accessions of a noisy enthusiasm, and which, before the year's end, is left by its projectors to die by the road-side, deserted and in silence, it is both gratifying and useful to trace the progress of a good work, undertaken without public display, and carried on through years of obscurity to final triumph, by the noiseless efforts of men inspired only with the desire of doing good.

The evening of October 2d, 1822, found four young men, interested in the condition of the young, in Christian truth, and in their own religious improvement, assembled together for the purpose of forming a society to promote these several objects. The names of these young men (for though they have taken no pains to have them recorded, the time will come when society may wish to know to whom it is indebted for one of its best institutions) were Frederick T. Gray, Benjamin H. Greene, Moses Grant, and William P. Rice. Some years later, Mr. Rice removed to Cincinnati, where, after a life made beautiful by modest, unassuming Christian faith and usefulness, he died in 1837. The others still live, to devote themselves in their ripened manhood to the same beneficent labors which awoke the enthusiasm of their youth.

For two months they held meetings every week; a few other friends joined them, but the brief record of their meetings is simply, that they did not hold out much encouragement of success. At length they formed themselves into an association, styled, "The Association of Young Men for their own Mutual Improvement and for the Religious Instruction of the Poor," which on the 4th of December, 1822, included nine gentlemen. Without entering into particulars, we may add, that the members met at each other's houses weekly, for the purpose of considering topics which related to their own personal improvement, or to the wants of the community, always keeping in view the fact, that their own religious growth must lie at the foundation of any great good which could be done by them for society. By degrees their number increased; and during the six years following, as appears from the records, the great subjects to which their meet-

ings were successively devoted were, the desirableness of employing a Missionary, and building a Mission-House; the condition and wants of Vagrant Children; the diffusion of Christianity in India; the importance of publishing Tracts and other Religious Publications; the means and best method of improving our State Prisons; the utility of forming a Unitarian Association; the best means to be adopted to abolish Intemperance; the character of Theatrical Entertainments; the want of Infant Schools; and the best measures which could be taken to aid in the promotion of Peace. All of these subjects were then comparatively new; they were but just beginning to attract attention; their importance was by no means generally understood, and least of all was the place which they were soon to occupy in public estimation anticipated. And here we cannot help saying a word respecting the character of these meetings. The young men who composed them were all of them entering into the business of life, and were dependent for success on their own exertions. When one considers both the temptations and the excuses which persons thus situated have for devoting their evenings to amusements, or to pursuits having no end but their personal advantage, the example of a band of young friends, privately and without pretence, dedicating their intercourse to these great questions of social usefulness, is itself worthy of remembrance. Though selfishness would never prompt such a method of spending time, no better method could have been devised for personal advantage. The true protection for the mind and heart of youth is to have them employed on subjects of real interest and importance. But beyond this, such employment is an admirable discipline for the higher qualities of character. It accustoms the mind to broad and generous views, secures a more extended information respecting the great interests of society, and trains up the young to take an active, wise, and efficient part in all labors that look to the good of the community. The young men who were united in these meetings were not distinguished in any way from a multitude of others; but the training to which they subjected themselves could not fail to produce results. If we were to enumerate those who in later years have been at the same time most judicious and most active in promoting

the religious and benevolent interests of this city, it would surprise one to find how many of them were trained in this modest society of friends, united for religious improvement and social usefulness.

But the association did not confine itself in any limited sense to the idea of self-improvement. From the beginning its proceedings took a practical form. In regard to the second object which its members had in view, — that of the religious instruction of the poor, — they endeavored to accomplish it by evening lectures and Sunday schools. Immediately after the formation of the association, a service was commenced in the chamber of a dilapidated building in Hatters' Square. At the request of the association, the first lecture was delivered by the Rev. Henry Ware, jr., to an audience of about a dozen. The lectures were soon so well attended, and gave such evidence of being useful, that great efforts were made for some months, but without success, to obtain a minister to the poor. The lectures, however, were continued till June, 1825, and for the most part the services were conducted solely by the members of the association.

In connection with the system of lectures, in 1823 they opened the Hancock Sunday School; one of the earliest — it being preceded by five only — in our denomination. The importance of such institutions was then so little understood, the difficulty in procuring teachers was so great, and the obstacles encountered during the first five years so many, that at one time the small and unassisted band of laborers had concluded to close it. But brought to the test, they could not be induced to give up an object of so much interest and hope; and their perseverance was at length crowned with success.

In 1825, the members of the association discontinued the evening lectures, but convinced, from experience, of their value, they renewed their efforts to obtain a permanent missionary among the poor, who, besides visiting them in their homes, should hold religious services on Sunday evenings. For some time, though several persons took the subject into consideration, no one could be found to undertake this office. At length they received information that Dr. Tuckerman, then a minister in Chelsea, had expressed a willingness to engage in this new

field of service, and that he would be present at the next meeting of the association. On the evening of November 5th, 1826, he first met its members, and arrangements were at once made with him, in accordance with which he immediately entered upon the duties of the Ministry at Large; an office to which his character and enthusiasm gave such importance and prominence before the public, that he may be said almost to have created it, and with it his name will henceforth, and most justly, be inseparably connected. The Sunday-evening lectures were recommenced in a large upper chamber, which had been occupied as a painter's loft, in what was called the Circular Building, at the junction of Merrimack and Portland Streets. Here Dr. Tuckerman preached his first sermon, December 2d, 1826. On the following Sabbath, the Howard Sunday School was opened. It was on a cold December morning, the thermometer not far from zero, — the wind whistling through the loose casements, — that seven teachers and three children gathered around a small stove, to give and receive the first lessons. It was a cheerless and discouraging beginning; but warm hearts were there, not easily disheartened, and accustomed to overcome difficulties. The number of scholars rapidly increased, to such a degree that, five years after its establishment, the school contained over two hundred children, thirty-eight teachers, and two superintendents.

The audiences which attended the evening lectures were so large, that the room where they were delivered was soon found to be quite inconvenient, and an effort was made to procure a more suitable place of worship. The Ministry at Large, however, had not yet won for itself that public favor which it now possesses, and it was with great difficulty that sufficient means to accomplish this object were procured. At last, however, through the exertions of a few persons, a lot of land was purchased, and a Free Chapel — a neat, one-story building — was erected on Friend Street. It was opened for public services, and the first sermon was preached, November 1st, 1828.

Dr. Tuckerman's health, from the beginning, had been infirm. Notwithstanding he was aided in the chapel services by members of the association, his diminished strength at length compelled him to discontinue preach-

ing, and during the summer the chapel services were suspended. At the close of Dr. Tuckerman's report for the year, he expressed the strong desire that some one should take his place, to whom he might act as an assistant, and on whom might devolve the whole duties of the chapel. In accordance with this wish, Mr. Charles F. Barnard, who was then about leaving the Divinity School, entered upon the work, in the autumn of 1832. The evening lectures were resumed, and a service for the children on the Sabbath commenced by him. He continued in this position for a year, when he established a Sunday-evening service, and a Sunday school at the south part of the city. Here his success was soon of the most encouraging character. Through his zeal, his unwearied exertions, and the liberality of those friendly to this Ministry, the Warren Street Chapel was erected, and dedicated in January, 1836. Charity never took a wiser form than in this enterprise. The children who have been connected with this chapel number not less than six or seven thousand, and they have been drawn, for the most part, from a class which was not connected with any existing religious organization. The amount of good which has been done through the various ministrations of the chapel is not to be measured, and not the least in value is the example of how much one man, of warm heart and persevering devotion to one great work, may accomplish. It is now twenty years since Mr. Barnard commenced his labors. His chapel is more flourishing than it ever was before; multitudes of young men and women, employed there as teachers, have been trained to philanthropic action; while the long and great experience of Mr. Barnard, his knowledge of pauperism, and his disinterested enthusiasm, have had a powerful influence in giving a wiser and more effective form to the charitable action of the city.

Mr. Barnard was succeeded at the Friend Street Chapel by Mr. Gray, in October, 1833. Under his vigorous and judicious control, every thing went on so prosperously, that at the end of two years the chapel was not large enough to accommodate those who wished to attend the services. Mr. Gray, aided by the friends of the Ministry, took measures to supply the wants; and a lot of land was procured, and the Pitts Street Chapel erected. The last

sermon in the Friend Street Chapel was preached by the pastor, November 6th, 1836. On removing to the Pitts Street Chapel, the Association, which had thus far had the charge of sustaining the ministry, transferred their trust to the Fraternity of Churches, which since 1836 has assumed the care of the Chapel, as well as the support of the Ministers at Large.

The manifest utility of the institution has caused it to grow steadily in popular favor. Among the ministers employed in its service, for different lengths of time and in different offices, have been Dr. Tuckerman, Mr. Barnard, Mr. Gray, Mr. Bartol, Mr. Waterston, Mr. Warren Burton, Mr. William Ware, Dr. Andrew Bigelow, Mr. John T. Sargent, Mr. Cruft, and Mr. Winkley. It now has a central office, and, including the Warren Street Chapel, three chapels and four ministers, while in the various Sunday schools, evening schools, sewing schools, etc., connected with the chapels, from two hundred and fifty to three hundred teachers are constantly employed.

The Ministry at Large has thus grown into an institution of great magnitude. It has not only been the means of much immediate good to the destitute and neglected, but, what is of more importance, the experience of its ministers has given rise in no small part to the better views now entertained respecting the true methods of improving the condition of the poor. Through its reports and through its connection with churches and society at large, it has diffused these views through the community. Year after year, in its various offices, it has been training up a large number of young men and young women to be wise and efficient laborers in every field of benevolent activity; while the success of the institution in the place of its origin has caused it to be adopted elsewhere, till it has become established in nearly every populous city of New England, and in several places in Great Britain.

In the account we have given of the Ministry at Large, our readers will observe that we have spoken of it as an institution. Of course we do not mean to say that the poor congregated in our cities were before this uncared for. On the contrary, we doubt if there be any city in Christendom where, in modern times, an abundance has not been given, to supply all bodily wants, if it had been given wisely. Nor have the spiritual wants been neg-

lected, although these have been comparatively but little regarded. In Boston, before the time of which we have spoken, Dr. Jenks was for a season employed as a city missionary by our Orthodox friends, and it is possible that others may have been engaged in the same work with him. But these cases were exceptional, originating in the benevolent impulses of individuals, and dying with them. So far as we know, the Ministry at Large was the first systematic effort to embody in a *permanent institution* the best ideas of the time respecting the true methods of Christian benevolence. It was the commencement of a new era in the annals of pauperism. It combined the methods of action which had been kept separate, and by being separated had been comparatively powerless for good. It proposed to furnish relief to the destitute, but never to do this without first investigating the condition of those who were aided. But the mere relief of physical want was not regarded as the principal thing. The two fundamental principles which controlled the organization were, first, to prevent the existence of pauperism, rather than merely to supply the wants of the poor; and, secondly, to bring the poor into connection with influences which should prevent their sinking into the gulf of pauperism, or which should raise those who were already paupers to a condition in which they should be self-supporting men and women. So long as the pauper character remains, it is impossible to furnish any permanent relief. The first purpose of the Ministry at Large was, therefore, to elevate the character of the pauper class; to reclaim the thriftless, the idle, the profligate, from the habits which were debasing them; to encourage the virtuous and industrious poor by sympathy, by needed aid, and by bringing them into connection with the more prosperous; to watch over exposed, forsaken, or neglected children; and, above all, and as the foundation of all, to bring them under religious influences such as should fortify their good purposes, give them encouragement in their trials, and, by the regeneration and elevation of the character, promote their true welfare here and hereafter. To this end a regular ministry was established, which should devote itself to investigating and meeting the wants of the poor; to this end chapels were reared and Sunday schools organized, while the minister was

expected to make himself familiar with those under his charge, in their homes. For the same general end, sewing schools for girls and evening schools for adults were established, and a general office, to which applicants throughout the city might be referred for aid, and from whose records important information might be derived by those who wished to aid the poor, was opened; and all of these were united in a permanent institution, whose existence should not depend on the transient impulses of individuals, but, connected with our churches, and supported by them, should have the same stability with them in the mode of support.

The importance of this institution, and its application to the wants of our time, is already generally recognized. But as yet the results which may be expected from it are only beginning to appear. The question of pauperism is the great social question of our day. It is no longer confined to the Old World. Owing to the great influx of foreigners, the number of persons in Boston alone, who annually receive more or less aid from the city, falls little short of ten thousand. The pauper class is steadily and rapidly increasing, and no institutions can be so important as those which, by the diffusion of intelligence and the inculcation of Christian principles, shall prevent the growth of the pauper character and the immeasurable evils of every description which exist wherever that character is found.

There are other subjects of which Mr. Gray treats in these Addresses, to which we should be glad to call attention; but we must refer our readers to the volume itself. We make one or two extracts, that may serve to show the style and spirit in which Mr. Gray discusses the great practical subjects to which he has given so much thought and time. The following extract contains an answer to the objection that Sunday schools interfere with domestic instruction: —

“Occupation, we cannot too often repeat it, is the secret of happiness, and these little men and women, like ourselves, need occupation. The Sunday school furnishes it. Their minds are interested; they have lessons to learn, questions to ask; and their parents feel the necessity of thinking and reading in order to satisfy their curiosity. Thus the whole family sympathize with the youthful members, who often find their turn to teach their

parents, by communicating some of the knowledge received at the Sunday school.

“Allowing, however, that the parent gives suitable instruction at home, without such aid has he not to encounter many difficulties? Does he not find it hard to fix the attention in the domestic circle? It is a very different thing to give instruction to children at home, and in a large circle of those of their own age. The stimulus in the latter case is incalculably greater. Let the children be sent to the school. Let the course of instruction pursued by the teacher be understood and followed out by the parent, so that when the time for instructing his children arrives, the exercise shall be a review of the lesson taught at the school. Let the children be questioned for an account, and receive, if necessary, some additional lessons particularly adapted to their character and wants, and the effect of such combined instruction would be far greater than could be expected from either alone. The preparation for private instruction is thus made at school, where the disposition to learn is cherished by many influences to be met with nowhere else.

“Association with their youthful acquaintance in their tasks will of itself be a means of exciting the liveliest interest, and securing a more willing and patient attention. Many obstacles to the success of domestic tuition are almost wholly done away at school; and the lessons at home give new efficacy to those which are learned abroad. How frequently have we witnessed the restlessness of children on their return from the school, till they had related all that was done there, and mentioned how happy they had been with their teacher.

“Will not this interest of the children call forth a corresponding interest in the parents? And shall we make no account of the effect of witnessing the solicitude of others for the welfare of their children? Can it be that they who hear so much concerning religious instruction should embrace no opportunity to impart it? Will those little faults which are the beginning of evil, and which can be known only to a parent, receive no correction? The parent, when he rebukes his child, will perceive with gratitude that the lesson makes a deeper impression from the previous influence of the Sunday School; and this will, while it produces the desired amendment, be no small testimony to the assistance rendered by these schools to the parent.” — pp. 15–17.

His suggestions to teachers are as worthy of attention now, as when they were first uttered:—

“Such are the encouragements we derive from a review of the effects of Sunday schools. If they are thus extensive, by whom are they achieved? It is by the persevering, faithful teacher,

who has taken upon himself the interesting and important duty of imparting religious instruction to the young ; who has commenced this work with religious feeling, with a due sense of its importance ; and who, in presenting religion and religious subjects to his pupils, teaches them to make it the governing principle of their lives.

" On this point let not enthusiasm mingle. The work needs it not ; but calls only for calm, deliberate consideration. We would receive the labors of any one in this work with whom religion has its due influence. We would invite those who are as yet unacquainted with them to come and assist us. But those who are acquainted need no solicitation ; it is the free-will offering, the voluntary suggestion of a benevolent mind, as they well know.

" Let none engage in this holy work with the cold and doubtful feelings of a task, but from a full conviction of its vast importance. He who acts understandingly, and from a deep impression of its value and usefulness, will seldom fail of accomplishing the desired object. Let there be no flagging steps, no dullness, seen in these schools, for the influence of this is fatal. Come, if at all, punctually and cheerfully, for the example of the inert, lifeless, tardy teacher paralyzes all effort. If only half the teachers in a school are interested, let these remain, and the rest leave ; for the activity and perseverance of a few will accomplish far more than the dull movements of many.

" I have heard some teachers apologizing for their tardiness, their absence, and their negligence. This is useless. Let us never forget that it is to ourselves and those committed to our care that we are to offer all such apologies, and that it is our own consciences we are to satisfy. The teacher should inquire whether he has the time and the opportunity ; whether his sphere of usefulness would be as extensive in this as it might be in some other society ; whether there is any way in which he can do more good. He is also to consider his domestic relations, his own improvement, and that of those with whom he is immediately connected. He is to look within, and reflect upon the subject ; he is to listen to the persuasion of friends, but he must not continue simply by their request or because the institution is popular. No ; he must consider his duty to the rising generation, and feel that God calls upon him to do what he can to promote the moral and spiritual welfare of those around him." — pp. 23-25.

On the adaptation of the instructions to the minds of children, he remarks : —

" These are matters of vital importance to our institution, yet the rest we would not leave undone. Whatever promotes order and regularity, whatever is conducive to the general comfort of

our pupils, is certainly deserving attention. But the teacher must realize that his office is beyond mere externals. He is the instructor of these little beings in their religion ; it is his privilege to raise their innocent hearts to heaven in love to their Creator, — his privilege to explain the sacred word of God, to point out the wonders of creation, and fit them to become religious and useful members of society.

“And how is he to do this ? By merely repeating in formal language what has been written on these subjects ? Can he expect thus to interest his little audience ? O, no ! we must not forget that children are only men in miniature. They have the same feelings as ourselves, and are as easily wearied by what is beyond their comprehension. We must be interested ourselves, if we would interest others. We must kindle in our own hearts the desire of goodness and knowledge, if we would inspire others with it. Then we shall not want language, and such as suits our subject ; the most simple is always the best.

“The mind of the child is often diverted from the subject by a word, of the meaning of which it is ignorant. It is requisite, therefore, to descend to the level of the intellects of children, make ourselves for the time their familiar companions, and become at once their instructors and friends. This alone would be a sufficient motive, but we have another ; it is thus only that children can be made to take an interest in Sunday Schools. We must begin with them from what they already know, and lead them, step by step, to what they do not know. We cannot force them from this path ; we may fill their memories with words ; but if we would interest their hearts and enlarge their minds, we must make them understand what we teach.

“Experience has long since taught us the truth of this. How often have we seen indifference in our pupils, when we ourselves were not interested in the subject. And how often have we seen intelligence and delight beam forth in their countenances when we ourselves were in earnest, and felt the importance and truth of what we were imparting to them. It is thus that reward has followed our exertions. Do we not find in every thing, that what is worth labor requires it ? and is the work we are engaged in so easy, that without some preparation we can faithfully perform our duty ? Do we find it so in other things ? O, no ! we are constantly lamenting that we have not time ; that we feel incompetent to undertake many things for the want of knowledge respecting them. Is this duty less important than many we have taken upon ourselves ? ” — pp. 64 – 66.

E. P.

ART. VII. — BARTOL'S DISCOURSES ON THE CHRISTIAN BODY AND FORM.*

THE author of the volume named below has in part anticipated both the necessity and the value of our labors as reviewers, by the excellence and the candor of his self-criticism in the introductory and concluding essays of his work. It is not necessary to inform any one who has read these portions of this volume, at what the writer has aimed, — what state of mind in the public he has sought to correct, — nor through what extremes of opinion he has endeavored to find a middle and a higher way. Here are twenty-six sermons, evidently selected from the author's stock of parish discourses, as written in a connected series, and all the more bearing the marks, in their spiritual continuity and tendency to one point, of a profound conviction, requiring expression and produced by some actual pressure in the moral atmosphere of the time. We value more, in religious writings, that sort of connection and method which an aim at practical usefulness or the actual supply of spiritual wants has created, than the more formal and artistic order begotten of a systematic effort at unity. Indeed, the sermons of our abler and more earnest brethren of every creed, could they be thus laid out before us, would furnish, we doubt not, in every case, a far better and sounder body of divinity than any of them could compile, — because inspired and corrected by a practical, in place of a speculative aim, and touching at every point the shores of reality. Sermons we more and more value, as the concrete expressions of Christian faith. We ask for more of them, and from more various quarters. Our own body has been specially rich and liberal in volumes of sermons during the last few years, and we have no occasion for any thing but pride and joy in contemplating the broad and ample shelf they occupy in our library. Instead of repressing the forwardness of our brethren, we would rather complain of the reserve and stinginess which shuts up many of the richest and most gifted sermonizers in our ranks, and confines their in-

* *Discourses on the Christian Body and Form.* By C. A. BARTOL, Junior Minister of the West Church in Boston. Boston: Crosby, Nichols, & Co. New York: C. S. Francis & Co. 1853. 12mo. pp. 376.

fluence to the narrow circle of their Sunday sermons. For what have paper and print become so cheap, but that every minister in the religious or any other useful field may, without peril or presumption, find his own audience through the press? A man is not to be supposed to be taking aim at posterity, who lets forth his volume in our day; and we are ill-natured enough to ascribe to pride quite as much as to modesty, to indolence and indifference quite as much as to humility, the continency of some of our most gifted preachers.

At any rate, no one can challenge the right of the present volume to its admirable typographic costume. It is, let us say fairly at the outset, a charming and edifying book. Did not a more laborious purpose demand our time and room, we should enjoy nothing more than a deliberate walk with our readers through its flowery and fruitful paths, pulling clusters of grapes and bread-fruits with one hand, and heliotropes and lilies with the other; and this would be our only office, for we confess ourselves ineligible to the bench, when, as it were, our own flesh and blood is at the bar. Did we say all we think of the copiousness of thought, the richness of illustration, the felicities of phrase, the depths of experience, the purity of heart, evinced in this volume, we should doubtless seem to be giving only another proof how heavy a retainer love takes, when friendship is his client, and on what oily terms are the advocate and the judge, when they share the profits of the verdict.

It is only the general topic called up by this work that we can here undertake to treat of, considered as a product of our religious times. It seems to us characteristically a return to faith. The positive, authoritative Gospel, set forth in this volume with such unction and skill, we hold to be a marked development of the religious temper of the times, — one of the good and blessed signs in our sky, — and all the more significant and important, hanging in the quarter it does. If our readers will trustingly accompany us through a few pages of general description of the nature, origin, and career of that spirit of doubt and alienation which has produced such a temporary decay of interest in the doctrines and forms of the Gospel, — but which, as we hope to show, is issuing in a nobler and better faith, and a revived inter-

est in every part of Christianity, both spirit and body, — we will promise to return, before dismissing them, to some further notice of the Discourses which have occasioned our article.

Nothing is more distinctive of the critical thought of our immediate times, than its recovering hold on Christianity, as a spirit and as an institution. Until within the present age, the criticism of the Church and of Christianity itself had been almost entirely conducted by outsiders, — avowed enemies and open destructives. The social and personal peril hanging over free-thinkers exasperated their doubts into fierce denials, and their suspicion into hatred. Scepticism was compelled to call to its aid the most belligerent passions and to take up the most ultra positions, in order to make its feebleness feared, or to gain any attention but that of persecution and loathing. The outcast avenged himself on the Christian Church which excommunicated, and the Christian society which disfranchised him, by round abuse of the Gospel on which they rested, as a superstition, a falsehood, a fraud, and a nuisance. If the amenities of elegant literature, or the dignity of the historic Muse, forbade in them the ribaldry and passion which marked the vulgar infidelity of their time, yet the great deists of the last century show in the poisonous sarcasms and malignant sneers and laborious underminings which they practise towards Christianity, that they are only tender to themselves, not to her, in any decorum or equivocation that belongs to their modes of attack. All they dared, they did, to destroy the foundations of faith in revealed religion, and in the institutions that represented it. They almost universally manifest neither doubt nor misgiving in their infidelity. That Christianity is a fable and a hindrance, is their settled conviction. If they do not say so, it is only that they may more successfully insinuate their scepticism, and the sooner accomplish for the Gospel the fate that belongs to frauds and follies. Could we summon Bolingbroke, Hume, Gibbon, Boyle, Voltaire, Paine, to the witness-stand of our own jurisdiction, they would be forced to confess that they had anticipated as the result of their own Antichristian speculations, or as the ultimate destination of the tendencies of thought of which they were so vigorous a manifestation, an entirely

different attitude towards Christianity in the learning, criticism, and original thought of this generation. They unquestionably thought themselves in the main current of the world's civilization, if not in the widened and improved channel of its progress. In their judgment, the abandonment of the Gospel was only a matter of time. After them, no history could again be written from a Christian point of view! They foresaw no Arnold, no Bunsen, no Niebuhr, no Guizot! No philosophy could again dare to treat revealed religion with deference; no science venture to lay its discoveries upon the Christian altar; no literature compromise its prospects, by association with decaying superstitions; and no statesmanship invite failure by overlooking the new religious conditions under which the advancement of society was to proceed.

How different the influence of the French Encyclopedists and the English Deists from what they hoped, or Christians feared! Attack is always strong, and defence always weak; and certainly the onset of the mighty sceptics of the eighteenth century was terribly effective, and the resistance of the sentinels and police of the Gospel miserably feeble. The best mind, the sharpest wit, the profoundest learning, the truest courage, the most practised eloquence, of that era, were in the ranks of infidelity. Despite their unpropitiousness towards the Gospel, we might as well blot the last century out of memory, as extinguish the lights which scepticism hung in its horizon. They were the principal luminaries, and that era would present a blank chasm in the sky of history, were those stars quenched to whose splendors the baleful rays of doubt contributed a lurid aspect. Their foes owe their reputation mainly to the names of the giants they attacked, or the goodness of the cause they defended, while they were largely indebted for their immediate safety to the contempt of their adversaries. Most of the "Apologies" for Christianity drawn forth by the alarm of that period are apologies indeed, and had the Gospel owed its prospects of life to the nursing of its friends, or the mercy of its enemies, it would have gone the way of all flesh, in spite of Watson and Horsley, of Leslie's Short Method, and Lardner's Credibility, and Paley's Evidences.

It would be interesting here, did our limits permit, to

show who were the real champions of faith at this era, and how little they owed their usefulness to historical criticism or direct opposition. First came the reverential students of natural science, such as Newton, Euler, Haller, and Swedenborg. Next, the mental philosophers, like Butler, and Reid, and Kant, who in their various modes undertook to find a foundation for religion and duty in the intellectual and moral nature of man. Finally, and most potent of all, the pietists of various schools, headed by Spener, who lived just to begin the century, and who was followed by Zinzendorf, Wesley, Benzel, Stilling, &c., who kindled the new spiritualism, so characteristic of the philosophy of the nineteenth century, — the heart's protest against mere intellectualism, which attained its utmost volume in Jacobi, and Schleiermacher who had been brought up by the Moravians. Even Rousseau, so tainted by sentimentalism and its kindred vices, became an apostle of the heart, and turned in horror from the Voltaire school of doubt, to construct a Christianity of his own out of the Gospel, and even in his failure succeeded in kindling a spirit capable of putting down Voltairism at last.

The infidelity of the last century was a necessity of the human mind, and its worst features were among its most useful traits. Up to that time, the Christian faith of the world had been compulsory. Religion was deemed out of the domain of legitimate thought, and a thousand political, social, and scientific errors had taken shelter within its sacred inclosure, as murderers found refuge in the ancient temples of the gods. The aroused intellect of the world, having exhausted its capabilities in the directions least conflicting with the Church, having won its greatest triumphs in poetry and architecture, painting and sculpture, in metaphysics and in classical lore, — and all the more successfully because the current of genius was dammed up to a narrow channel, — now began to chafe against forbidden themes, and to break with impatience upon the shores that resisted its rising tide, forced by the winds of Providence up new inlets. The faith of the world had, from very custom, become a superstition. Christianity had intrenched itself in the indolence and the senses of mankind. The bad doubted it no more than the good, and the good believed it no more than the bad.

There was no living connection between the spiritual senses and the objects of their report. The witnesses were false witnesses, even when they testified to the truth; and their evidence was bribed by custom and fear and sloth, though it sustained the right and the holy. The Gospel, from a living spirit hovering over human hearts, as the Pentecostal flames burnt on the Apostles' foreheads, had become a huge brand on the hearth of modern civilization, a light, indeed, at one extremity, and giving warmth to the house, but thrusting its shapeless end into the midst of the floor, embarrassing every movement in the household. Science stumbled at every vigorous step she made, politics tore her generous robe, ethics was cramped, history confused, economy baffled, and thought itself blackened and bruised. Yet here had this sacred fuel been smouldering for ages, chief source of the light and warmth of the family! What inconveniences, what sacrifices, would not be borne, before one splinter of its bulk were pared away! Nay, would not the disadvantages it made necessary, the evils it perpetuated, come, through association, to be as sacred as the benefits it conferred, and indistinguishable from them? So, indeed, it was; and Christianity, the mother of infinite blessings, was, in its identification with the visible Church and the iron creed, becoming a mighty oppressor of the human intellect, when the great rebellion of the last century broke out.

None but giants could have forced the gates of a prison made out of a temple; its walls built by God, to form the everlasting shelter of the race, but whose doors — once moving on golden hinges, and affording free access and departure — had long since been closed from within, and barricaded by the broken furniture of ages, or buried beyond discovery in heaps of priestly rubbish or ecclesiastical ashes. No hand too much afraid of defacing the sacred wall could have even found the door, much less have dared to break it down. No spirit as anxious to preserve what was true, as to destroy what was false, — to save the innocent and costly roof that had nevertheless been its jail, as to escape from confinement, — could ever have achieved this emancipation. It was necessary that infidelity should be in earnest, hearty and uncompromising, to break the oppressive stupor of faith;

that the pretensions of Christianity itself should be challenged, so inseparably had a usurping Church identified itself with the Gospel; and that the human intellect, treated like a serpent by the great representative of religion, should at length use a serpent's wiles, and turn and sting the oppressor's foot, that it might show its power, if it could not vindicate its benignity, and achieve that freedom through fear which it could not win by long service.

So long as Christianity, as administered by its representatives, challenged belief under penalties, and commanded assent without any alternative but ruin, it was impossible that the intellect of the world could come to any honest terms with it. The truer it was, the better it could afford to submit its claims to examination, and the more inexcusable its dogmatism and arbitrariness. But so rooted had become the habit of confounding religious faith with a prostration of the understanding before verbal propositions of the Church, that there was no hope of any emancipation of the intellect, except through a desperation to which faith itself had become indifferent.

We are now reaping the fruits of this revolt. The belligerent infidelity of the last century, in which philosophers, historians, and poets were united, achieved its end. The human intellect vindicated its right, unchallenged by faith, to explore every corner of the universe, and every avenue of thought, and to apply its severest logic, its sharpest criticism, to religion, and every thing over which religion had extended its smothering protection. Politics, science, economy, — parts of which had always been so involved with ecclesiastical claims, as to share their immunity from examination, — were now subjected to the right of search, which reason had wrested from superstition. There is now no subject of interest to men, the perfectly philosophical or scientific discussion of which is not possible, somewhere within the domain of thought. The moral *Index Expurgatorius* is in force, to a certain extent, in the most highly civilized communities; but the cost of disregarding it is reduced so low, that it imposes no restraint upon any intellect rich enough to be entitled to independent explorations. The Church has essentially abandoned its hostility to free inquiry; for it has discovered that its hold upon the world is not by the precarious tenure of the understand-

ing; that reason has no proper quarrel with faith, the Gospel nothing to fear from science or philosophy.

And this is the greatest triumph which Christianity has had since it ascended the throne of the Cæsars, — its victory over the unchained intellect of the nineteenth century. He that closed the mouths of lions upon his prophets could alone have anticipated so quick and thorough an escape of the Gospel from the angry jaws of a scepticism whose hunger eighteen centuries of fasting had sharpened.

So deeply planted has the Gospel proved itself to be in the affections, the necessities, and the moral experience of the world, that its sturdy trunk has not only withstood the whirlwind of infidelity let loose upon it, but its branches have afforded protection to the least vital and most dependent parasites clinging to their tops. What testimonial to its essential truth and necessity did Christianity ever receive, more honorable or more satisfactory than the revival of the Catholic Church in the middle of an age like this, and in the very countries most enlightened by education, most blessed with freedom, most accustomed to free inquiry? If it be supposed that Catholicism owes its resurrection to what is peculiar in its system, and not to the inherent power of that common truth it represents, it only the more proclaims the immense strength of the Christian faith, which is seemingly immortal even in its most vulnerable parts. The intellect of the world, in its freest play, cannot make faith let go its hold upon any thing it even mistakes for the robe of Christ.

Religious belief has proved itself so much more natural, necessary, delightful to man, than any intellectual consistency or propositional harmony, that those whom their studies carry nearest the verge of infidelity are very often found shortly afterwards snugly ensconced in the bosom of the most exacting Church on earth. Meanwhile science, philosophy, history, and literature have taken on an entirely new temper in regard to Christianity. Whereas, for the larger part of the eighteenth century, all the higher branches of human inquiry were either openly or secretly hostile, or, what was far worse, indifferent, to revealed religion, and every respectful reference to the subject was formal and unmeaning,

as if only the decent deference due to a decaying superstition; now, on the contrary, an open, genuine, and deep reverence for the Gospel characterizes the profoundest, the freest, and the most successful inquiries in science, in history, and in philosophy, — a reverence which does not embarrass, but actually assists, discovery.

A Christian theology seems to have resumed its seat among the sciences, and to participate, without assumption and without deprecation, in their councils. Above all, literature, which is the meeting-point of the highest thought and the broadest life of the age, — where meditation and experience unite, and the brain of the time finds its heart and lungs and muscles, — literature is in our day penetrated with Christian ethics and evangelical sentiments, and criticizes the Church, not for its credulity and assumption, but for its want of faith and activity. The most popular works of the day are works in which piety, not piracy, makes the interest of their heroes, and Uncle Tom and Peggotty take the place of Conrad and Paul Clifford. The spontaneous tendency to faith and veneration evinced in the lighter reading of the day, is one of the most encouraging proofs of the revival of a genuine interest in Christianity as a living religion. Amid the censures with which the blue-and-yellow-clad literature of our time is liberally covered, and in the pious haste to think every thing evil which is cheap and popular, especially if it come from France, a gross injustice is done both to the authors and the readers of a very large portion of it. It is only recently that we have ourselves had any opportunity of examining what we confess we had passed by with a somewhat complacent contempt or pious horror; but we acknowledge, with contrition and joy, that far the larger portion of the popular novels produced in our time are eminently moral in their intention, reverential in their spirit, and wise and Christian in their philosophy. Mrs. Gore's novels, for instance; Mrs. Norton's recent admirable works; Mrs. Marsh's books, — what can be more thoroughly pure or more genially pious than these popular writings? But above all, what account but one in the highest degree favorable to the rising spirit of faith and reverence can be given of the gracious revolution in the character and spirit of Bulwer? Paul the Persecutor and Paul the

Martyr are not more nor better contrasted than the writer of "Pelham" and "Eugene Aram" and the author of "The Caxtons" and "My Novel."

If we turn from the indirect evidence afforded by the higher and the popular literature of the times, of the inclination of the world's heart towards religion, and the Christian religion, to the direct testimony offered by the nature and character of the expressly religious and anti-religious action and writings of the day, we are only sustained and encouraged in our belief, that a determined hold on the Gospel and its institutions is the nearly unanimous resolve of the age. It is hard to say whether the satisfied or the dissatisfied friends of Christianity and the Church are now the more numerous or the more serviceable. We look in vain for any class of respectable foes to the Gospel. Critics enough, but not too many, there are, of the dogmas and forms and ecclesiastical embodiments of Christianity. But against whom can intelligent and pious minds, not the heirs of the prejudices under which their religious education commenced, direct, with any judicial sobriety, the opprobrious charge of infidelity? It is not because there is no such thing as infidelity, but because there are no such people as infidels in any influential position, that this language is losing its place in the vocabulary of the best Christian criticism. For our own part, either from want of subtilty or from a more believing constitution, we are not troubled with the difficulties respecting miracles which perplex the transcendental school of critics; nor does the view of Christianity which the naturalists present at all meet our wants or convictions. We are all the more free, therefore, to declare our total dissent from the spirit and policy which denounces as unbelievers those who reject the popular and our own grounds of belief. What grosser injustice to the spirit of the Gospel or the mind of Christ, than to nickname as infidel the writings of such men as Newman and Gregg, or Parker and Henry James? Does any body, who has taken the pains to inquire, doubt whether these men venerate and love the person of Christ, and are seeking to introduce his kingdom into the world? whether they regard him as the founder of the saving faith of men since his day? whether their doubts or differences touch the heart of his religion?

The question is not how successfully they maintain the Christian spirit in an attitude of great trial and temptation; nor whether they are either logically or practically consistent, — sound in their reasonings or sound in their lives, — but whether they are truly, heartily believers in the religion of Jesus Christ. And for ourselves, we doubt it no more than we doubt the Pope's or the Archbishop of Canterbury's faith in Christianity, and should as soon presume to call them infidels as these men. An infidel is a disbeliever in the Gospel of Christ. No man, to whom that Gospel is the first object of his thoughts, labors, and reasonings, — who refers all his other judgments to it as the central truth, — is a disbeliever, let his account of Christianity be what it will. He may have his own speculative notions respecting the *evidence* of Christ's authority, or the nature of his authority, as moral or personal, — respecting miracles or inspiration; but if he accepts on any grounds Christianity as his *religion*, — if it be to him the highest and most affecting and influential manifestation or revelation of God, — if he consider his own view of its authority the most potent and most sacred idea of authority of which his nature admits, — then he is a believer in Christianity to all intents and purposes, and, in our judgment, it is mere dogmatism and fanaticism to call him an enemy or an infidel. We must either cease this foolish cry of infidelity towards every thing that differs from our own view of religion, or else soon find that "unbeliever" carries no reproach with it, and "believer" no dignity.

It is a happy thing for the world, that the criticism of the Church, and of that development of the faith of Jesus which is called Christianity, now proceeds most actively and ably from within, and from friendly hands. The jealousy of ecclesiastics and creed-mongers, who usually arrogate to themselves the whole patronage of our religion, is directed now, not towards avowed infidels and worldly enemies of the Gospel, but against those who claim to be true and devoted friends of Christianity, and who in her name are active laborers in every field of moral, philanthropic, or spiritual benevolence. The most dangerous enemies of the Gospel in our day, if we can believe some of our Christian brethren, are men laboring with heart and soul to bring society up to the New Tes-

tament standard, — men of prayer and of charity, — men distinguished for purity, simplicity, earnestness, courage, faith, but not ready or able to subscribe any human creed, nor bound by any system of received opinions, nor pledged to any philosophical or historical theory respecting the Scriptures, — men, in short, who differ radically from the majority of disciples, in the freedom of their speculations, and in their indifference to the results of free inquiry respecting the origin of our religion, but who nevertheless receive Christianity as a fact, as *the* fact, and make it the business and joy of their lives to receive and propagate its influence and its truth.

Now we hold it to be the noblest triumph of the Gospel, that it is thus placing itself among the indisputable verities, the everlasting facts, of human experience, — as true as summer and winter, as the multiplication-table, as the tides. And is not this its real position, when the only important unbelievers are of the character here described?

And this we take to be the practical solution of the perplexing question of Christian evidences. Christianity is true, because the human race cannot disbelieve it, cannot do without it; not because it can be incontrovertibly established as history. We fully believe it to be history; but we are almost ready to say, that, if it could be proved according to the ordinary means and methods of historical inquiry, it would not be the religion we require. If a child could remember the birth of his own parent, he would have no father, but only a progenitor. If Christianity had sprung into being within the period of the modern world's intellectual consciousness, it might be a philosophy, but it could be no religion. Its sources must lie back of the farthest explorations of our curiosity, to bring us down the living water of faith and reverence. Miracle alone could have overcome for the first disciples the disadvantages of novelty and direct vision; and the credulity and superstition of the earlier ages of our faith mingled profitably with the recency of Christianity, to supply what age alone could give the instructed intellect of the world, — veneration and dependence. The absolute authority of the Church, forbidding investigation, and shrouding the Gospel with splendid drapery, that attracted respect while it prevented inspection, was a prov-

idental rooting of the Gospel in the dark mould of ages preparatory to the rising winds of intellect which were to shake its sacred boughs. The ages of faith — ages of ignorance though they were — alone could prepare a religion for the ages of curiosity and speculation and common sense. This, humanly speaking, makes Christianity the religion of the world, — that, containing a system of pure ethics, and implying a theology consonant with reason, meeting the wants and affections of the human heart, it has a history older than our civilization, and a beginning which cannot be fully explored. It is alike undeniable and undemonstrable in its historic character. It cannot be vulgarized by ordinary proof, nor discredited by historic witnesses. He must be a bold and reckless man who pronounces its literal history fabulous, or its records untrue. He must be more learned than Lardner, more fortunate than Paley, more penetrating than Gibbon, who bridges that dark and disastrous gulf over which the venerable Polycarp, in his shattered boat, has stood sole ferryman since historical criticism commenced its baffled journey to the Apostles' feet.

Let us not be understood as depreciating either the importance or the interest of the external evidences of Christianity. Believing in the Gospel and in the records, we hold it to be the most natural of processes to investigate the early history and substantiate the historical truth of Christianity. More and more, probably, will this elevated curiosity be piqued and employed, as the principles of historical investigation are better understood. But we neither regret the obscurity of the search, nor acknowledge its success, while we hold fast to our historic faith. In respect of evidence, Christianity, meanwhile, stands just where we would have it stand, — its feet on the shadowy past, its hands on our responsive bosoms. Our religion is a fact; and the Niger might as well be disputed as a river, because of its unknown source, as Christianity of being an historical reality, because of its obscure origin. We doubt not the Niger has an honest source, and one adequate to its current. How can we doubt that a divine religion — divine by every testimony of human experience, divine in its moral purity, divine in its portraiture, divine in its fitness to human wants, divine in its literary aspect and in all its trace-

able history — had also a divine source? The world cannot doubt it, because under every provocation it does not doubt it. The Gospel has identified itself too much with the fortunes of the human heart, — civilized man is too much mixed up with it, and it with him, — it has worn for itself too deep a channel in the common soul, — to permit its future fortunes to be any thing but the fortunes of humanity. We have taken it for better and worse. The world has made itself the Church, that it might be the bride of Christ; and what God has joined, let no man — and no man nor body of men can — put asunder. The intellect of the age, vindicating its right to inquire into and to legitimate the faith of the age, started up, and is still on foot, asking the right of Christianity to its place in the world. But it does not determine, it only measures, that place; and if it cannot measure it, it does not change the fact of its existence. But it is even terrified at its own inability to settle the claims of Christianity with affirmative force; feeling much as a child who loves its father may be supposed to feel on some suspicion arising respecting its parentage. There is nothing sadder in all literature than Blanco White's pursuit of the Christian faith under the guidance of the intellect. No bereaved child ever sobbed for its mother's bosom more bitterly than he for a faith that his intellect could wholly substantiate. And does not its own sorrow clearly begin to teach the human understanding, that the soul's instincts, affections, and wants are wiser than the logical faculty, and that when we cease to believe every thing we cannot prove, we shall drop nine tenths of all our most valuable confidence and practical knowledge? What seems, therefore, just now to engage the philosophical intellect of the time in regard to Christianity, is not the hopeless task of proving it by any evidence the force of which is not now universally felt, but the endeavor to explain and justify the reception of the Gospel on the moral evidence upon which it is received. This, it will be perceived, is not a practical, but a purely speculative inquiry, — having nothing to do with the actual influence of the Gospel, or the real faith of the world. That seems to have been settled by the laws of the human soul, and the original adaptedness of Christianity to man's nature and state.

If, now, we inquire for a moment what change has come over the prevailing ideas of Christianity under the keen examination of the intellect of the age, we think it must be generally acknowledged that that poverty-stricken conception of it as a scheme of doctrine, or collection of facts, carefully fenced in from all other experiences and all other influences; communicated and perfected in the Apostolic times; and then, by an ecclesiastical channel, poured down in its original import, with no more and no less a burden than it carried at its birth, with no contribution, or development, or interpretation from the history and the experience of humanity;—that such a conception of Christianity, though still formally upheld, is essentially without foundation in the inner consciousness or practical convictions of the instructed mind of this age. The development theory of the learned, stripped of all its mysticism, is the judgment of the common sense of our day, when not afraid to know its own mind. The wonderful fact about Christianity, meanwhile, is, that although in every new age it displays larger proportions, a greater elasticity, a freer accommodation of itself to the progress of the race, it never loses its place at the head of the purest civilization and the highest intelligence. If it relax its ecclesiastical hold, it tightens its dogmatic grasp, and if it loosens its doctrinal tenure, it shortens its moral rein. The arbitrary authority of the Church, the Scriptures, the theology of Christendom, is undeniably so much impaired as to threaten or promise utter extinction. But neither the Church, the Bible, nor even the ancient dogmas of Christendom, are less dear or less influential because the ground of their reception is changed. Many a child never loves his teacher till he has escaped from his ferule; many a son never honors his parents till he can do something for their support. The Church, the Scriptures, the old dogmas, having ceased to command the human intellect on peril of temporal or eternal ruin to do them a blind homage, now begin to receive a loving, voluntary service, most manifest in those who have most thoroughly escaped from their compulsory rule.

We have made a long preface to our notice of the volume of sermons now open before us, and yet one which grew fairly out of their perusal. For here, out of

the bosom of the most liberalized Christian community, and from a mind peculiarly emancipated from authority, tradition, creeds, and rituals, comes a vigorous plea for Christianity as a definite and dogmatic system, — for the Church as a formal and authoritative institution. We should value this plea very little if it rested upon the old ground, — if it were an appeal to the ignorance, the blindness, the fears, the superstition of the public, — or reposed upon historical argument and logical foundations. But we attach the highest importance to it precisely because it makes its appeal to the moral experience, the evangelical affections, and the spiritual wants of this age. So far as we know, it is the first, and certainly it is the best, practical attempt, since the rise of a true criticism of Christianity, to give body and form to the Gospel, — a precise mould and tangible substance, without putting feet of clay on the image, in the shape of human dogmas and a coarse external authority. It is the resurrection body which can pass freely through any door where the disciples wait for their Lord, that our author ascribes to his religion; not that body of flesh and blood which cannot inherit the kingdom of heaven. Holding to the great universal doctrines of Christendom in their generous proportions, without a presumptuous nicety of definition, or a licentious and chilling obscurity of outline, — equally free from sectarianism and indifference, — he presents the articles of the Christian faith to the souls of his readers; not to their understandings, not to their hearts, but to their souls; and by every appeal to experience, to want, to affection, to common sense, commends them to cordial acceptance. In like manner, the simple rites of Christianity received in all ages and communions, with insignificant exceptions, but which the mingled spiritualism and utilitarianism of the author's neighborhood had threatened with neglect, or deprived of due significance, he rescues from contempt or disuse; not by bold exaggeration of their importance, or priestly assumption of their authority, but by making their authority felt in the intense significance they possess for the thoroughly Christianized mind and heart.

It is evident that the writer of this work has lived into the heart of Christianity, as a spirit and as an institution. His former volume of Sermons, on "The Chris-

tian Spirit and Life," displayed his practical acquaintance with the results of the Christian faith; the present volume—at this day a far more important contribution to our religious literature—displays his acquaintance with the ways and means of Christianity. While, on the one hand, we cannot rejoice too heartily that the substance of the Gospel is at length securing the studious attention of those who for so long a time have been engrossed with the distillation of its essence; on the other, we congratulate ourselves still more, that the medicinal properties of the tree of life are not to be overlooked in admiration of its floral beauty. The Gospel is essentially a method. Its distinctive endowments are working powers. It is not distinguished so much by its great precepts, "Love God" and "Love man,"—which are not peculiar to it,—as by the means which it furnishes for exciting the love it commands. How to love God and man was the desideratum, and this Christianity teaches by the discipline and development of affections and purposes which its ministerial methods, its doctrines, symbols, hopes, promises, facts, examples, afford to the obedient spirit. To apply its ways and means, its healing and its guidance, to the sick and blind soul,—this is the work of its missionaries and representatives; and this is just what our author himself does, and teaches us to do, when, in the present work, he brings the very atmosphere of Palestine, the very presence of Christ, the very modes and sentiments and threatenings and injunctions used by Jesus himself in healing sinners, to bear upon us sinners of the nineteenth century.

We have recently had, in sermons and elaborate articles, a good deal of criticism of creeds and churches from the external point of view furnished by philosophy and worldly experience, by science and history and common sense. Able, wise, and serviceable men have considered Christianity in its contrasts and in its analogies with all other things, and furnished us with a sort of compromise between worldly and heavenly wisdom,—holding an unprejudiced and even scale between the claims of evangelical and all other truth. But while our author shows himself fully acquainted with all other systems of thought and philosophy, he is out and out a Christian,—pledged exclusively to the special interests of the Gospel, and

depending wholly on its arsenal for his weapons, on its methods for his influence. By conviction, affection, and settled purpose, he stands inside the Gospel, and looks out from its inclosure upon the world, — opening its windows and doors to let forth its doves and bestow its gifts, and mounting its towers as the most commanding point of view whence to survey the landscape of humanity. To him the Gospel is not a state residence, or a picturesque castle, or a fortress of retreat, but a home, — a house genial with tended fires and furniture disposed for use, a table freshly spread, and occupants familiar and dear, — from which, as from a place to live and die in, the world and its philosophy and science and experience are to be surveyed with unanxious yet keen interest, but without a thought of ever deserting the Christian homestead under any attractions or detractions, or from any panic or promise, coming from without. It is as to a home, — his Father's house, — that he invites the weary and the wandering, when, with affectionate fidelity, he describes all the accommodations and conveniences for the sick, the wretched, the hungry, and the shelterless, which belong to the Gospel of Christ. An indescribable domesticity of feeling pervades the author's account of Christian doctrines and Christian rites, — as if it were some better "elder brother," who had sought the younger son, and was winning the prodigal back by stirring the precious memories and household affections slumbering in his heart.

But in another sense, also, the writer of these Discourses stands within the Gospel he commends. Starting from the vital principle and organic affections of the Gospel, he describes the body and form of Christianity as having grown out of the Spirit, not merely as containing it; as possessing the vitality and giving architectural expression to the life of Christ's truth, not as the edifice built over it, which must be penetrated to find its inmate, and might be changed without injury to its occupant. In that wonderfully suggestive, but somewhat fanciful work of Wilkinson's, called "The Human Body and its Relations to Man," the vulgar prejudices by which the relations of the flesh and the spirit are ordinarily described, as if body and soul were opposites and enemies, and without any other than a forced and temporary con-

nection, are mercilessly exposed. We are there made to feel that the body is a growth of the soul, and as much entitled to respect and reverence as is any other part of the being. In a similar temper, Mr. Bartol leaves us with the conviction, that the body and form are not accidental, inferior, perishable parts of Christianity, — the shell and costume of the spirit and life, — but the incarnated word, — the proper and eternal shape and visible presence of Christianity, — having for the sole condition of their perpetuity the continued existence of beings with our wants and organs to receive and require them. In his hands, the forms and doctrines and methods of the Gospel appear no less spiritual than its precepts, temper, and essence, and precisely as the figure and features and speech and movements of a saint heighten and clarify our conceptions of his devoutness, so the rites and forms of our religion nourish and purge our spiritual apprehensions of it.

Much attention is now drawn, very happily, to the uses of the imagination in the interpretation and digestion of Christian doctrines and forms. Drs. Bushnell and Park have rendered invaluable services to our New England theology by their powerful pleas for its free exercise in the study of religion; and the able Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education is awakening the attention of teachers to its neglected rights and powers throughout his extensive sphere of influence. We know no modern writer on religious themes who possesses a purer, more fertile, or more useful imagination than the author of this volume. It is perhaps his first intellectual attribute, the distinctive feature of his mind. Subtile and rare as his thoughts and emotions are, they all take on emphatic shapes in his creative fancy, — bodies as airy and spiritual as themselves, yet distinctly bounded and colored. There is nothing so gross to vulgar minds, that his touch cannot purify and spiritualize it; nothing so aerial, that the same finger cannot give it a local habitation and a name. It is this realizing imagination which has enabled our author to enter so deeply into the Oriental heart of our religion, and to show us that human nature must itself be Orientalized as a part of its very regeneration; that the decay of the imagination is one of the worst consequences of sin and sensuality, — the ugliest part of

the ruin of the soul,—the ophthalmia which blinds the mind to the cathedral grandeur, extent, and complexity of the Gospel system, and leaves a few awkward buttresses, unmeaning columns, and disconnected pinnacles, in discordant and isolated shapes, pricking the dull retina, and passing for the architecture of Christianity. By intense meditation and fervid feeling and poetic sympathy, Mr. Bartol has organized and unified the great doctrines and forms of Christianity, until, free alike from abstractness or particularity, without sharpness of outline or confusion of parts, they stand together a glorious temple, whose wings and dome are lost in the horizon and the heavens, but whose portal opens at our knock, and in whose shelter or shadow we find all the heat and all the coolness our fainting hearts alternately require.

And this brings us round to our starting-point. It is as a living reality, as an actual fact, as a proved necessity, that our author presents the Gospel. He takes its truth for granted, as established by the best of all evidence, the growing affection, confidence, and reverence of human nature for nearly two thousand years. He does not ask what Christianity ought to be, or might be made, but only what it is; or rather he does not so much ask that, as allow it to present itself in its time-hallowed and eternal aspect, and claim the love and service of the hearts for which it was made. It is this positive, real, healthy downrightness of faith, embracing the Gospel as the greatest and most glorious fact, the oldest and most venerated institution, the profoundest necessity and the most precious luxury of society; this bold yet modest reliance upon the uncorrupted faith of the human heart towards its greatest benefactor, Christ; this free yet strict, spiritual yet formal, transcendental yet practical, authoritative but deferential, simple yet complex, poetical yet plain statement of our common religion,—which, while it gives its charm and power to this work, is still more valuable as indicative of the religious tendencies of the times; promising from the very bosom of criticism and free inquiry to bring forth a more lowly and implicit faith,—from the very quarter of sharp and dialectic distinction to furnish a generous and flowing outline of the living Gospel, and from anti-creed and anti-ritual positions to illustrate a catholic reception and

fruition of all the truths, sentiments, and usages in Christianity, which the devout affections and heart-inspired reason of the race have proved to be life-giving, comforting, and saving to the soul.

H. W. B.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

The Works of SAMUEL HOPKINS, D. D., First Pastor of the Church in Great Barrington, Mass., afterwards Pastor of the First Congregational Church in Newport, R. I. With a Memoir of his Life and Character. Boston: Doctrinal Tract and Book Society. 1852. 3 vols. 8vo. pp. 266 and 534, 770, 798.

It was by the Memoir, which fills a third part of one of these solid volumes, that we were attracted through the promise of an expectation that has been more than fulfilled. For this Memoir is not only from the pen of Professor Park of Andover, but it is also such a labor of hearty, painstaking, and enthusiastic love, that the whole structure of it and every page of it have a freshness which carries a reader through its perusal with an intense interest. We know not where to look for an equally charming Memoir, even on the shelves so laden with pious and skilful biographies of deceased divines. Apart from all the doctrinal and controversial issues opened by this biography, the human story, the portraiture of a character, the method and experience of a life as presented in it, and all, too, with such a rare felicity of style, have chained our attention, and made us feel a deep regret that it was not even more extended, that the pleasure it affords might have been prolonged.

And yet we have more than once drawn our eyes from the book, and wondered that we could follow its narrative with a common, natural, human interest. For we have accompanied its perusal with an occasional reference to the "System of Doctrines," Essays, and Sermons which accompany it, and have been lost in amazement at the stern and appalling views so pertinaciously advocated by a kind-hearted and right-minded man. How any one could study the Bible with the entire devotion which Dr. Hopkins gave to it, and could spend a long life of the most generous self-consecration in addressing from it lessons of piety and duty to man, and yet could have so strangely misinterpreted what seems to us to be the truth beaming from every

sentence of it,—this is to us a riddle which makes our very brain to ache. The only solution which we can find for it is in referring the unscriptural theology of this Divine, persisted in and indurated as it was, to the irresistible bias of an early Calvinistic training. Sentences of Scripture were associated in his first religious exercises with a view of the Divine government and of the nature, relations, and destiny of man which no after-thought or study had power to alter or to rectify.

Our readers may call to mind that delightful little piece of reminiscence which Dr. Channing has given us in a Note to his Sermon at Newport, on occasion of the dedication as a Unitarian church of the edifice in which Dr. Hopkins had ministered. In the body of that Sermon, as well as in the Note, Dr. Channing has spoken of Dr. Hopkins in terms of most respectful personal regard, while he has at the same time characterized his hideous and direful creed with a most felicitous power. If we remember rightly, the Unitarian divine becomes almost jocose as he pleasantly records how the Calvinistic preachers of his day could deliver sermons on the torments of the wicked in hell, and then go home with an unimpaired appetite to enjoy a hearty dinner. So little of stern reality was there in the professed belief of such tenets. The delicate skill with which Dr. Channing treated the noble-hearted teacher of a most grim theology, the genial spirit which so fully appreciated the self-denying and philanthropic advocate of a most unrelenting and inhuman doctrinal system, may have helped to quicken our interest in this Memoir. But if we grant this, it shall be no abatement of our grateful thanks to Professor Park for his thorough and admirable delineation of a life and character in which there was so much of lofty virtue and of Christian excellence. Our ideal of one of the better sort of New England ministers, in the generations before our own, is a high one, but it is exalted by this Memoir, in which, with the utmost simplicity of outward circumstances and through a rugged way of duty, we see a man without any indebtedness to fortune, with the worst possible delivery, with no regular salary for a dependence, and with a creed so harsh, and so inflexibly announced as rather to repel than to win sympathy, nobly pursuing his work in life as a faithful minister of Jesus Christ. The biographer seems to have spared no labor in hunting out materials, not so much to enrich as to complete his memorial. He has so classified and arranged the particulars which he wished to communicate, and has so relieved the weariness of a continuous narrative by numerous subdivisions and episodes, and has so skilfully interwoven passages from diaries, letters, and other sources, with his own web, that the attention of a reader can scarcely flag on a single page. One may well understand, like-

wise, that the task of delineating the mind and the theology of Dr. Hopkins was not wholly free from certain delicate risks and liabilities for an Andover Professor, considering how the theology of that School now stands in the view of the whole Calvinistic communion.

Dr. Hopkins was born at Waterbury, Conn., on Sunday, September 17, 1721, and died at Newport, R. I., on Tuesday, December 20, 1803, in the sixty-second year of his ministry, and in the eighty-third year of his age. He came of a most religious stock, and considered it his highest honor to have been descended from ancestors who for two centuries had been professors of religion, "and many of them, if not all, *real Christians*." He dreamed, when young, that the sentence to hell pronounced against the wicked in Matthew xxv. was passed against him and his brother; a dream from the impression of which he seems never to have been rid through the remainder of his life. A severely logical and mathematical training at Yale, with a strong metaphysical tendency in his own nature, seems to have fitted him for the task of his life as a dogmatical theologian. By his own account of himself, he joined the Church, that is, made a public profession of religion, when he was in an unconverted state, and was unable afterwards to decide whether the incident should be dated in his eighteenth or in his nineteenth year. As that incident in the religious history of one who holds the Calvinistic creed is of such vital and paramount importance, — because the inward process which it is supposed to indicate decides the most awful and momentous issue of one's destiny for eternity, — we cannot but marvel at any confusion of memory as to the precise time of its occurrence. But we find throughout the Memoir of Dr. Hopkins many allusions which indicate his own misgivings as to the signs and tokens commonly relied upon to prove "the spiritual birth." For instance, his Diary gives this record: — "Was sent for in the intermission to-day to go and see ———. The messenger said she was dying; but when I came there, I found her full of joy and comfort, supposing she had had saving discoveries of Christ. She admired the goodness of God, and called upon all to praise him. Upon examining her, I was satisfied that she was deceived; that it was only the workings of her imagination. She was confident; but I told her my fears. How exposed to the delusions of the Devil are ignorant persons! especially those whose understanding is shattered, and their imagination lively by a fever." (Memoir, pp. 36, 37.) Frequent as have been the descriptions of the Calvinistic process of conversion or regeneration, and similar as they all are in substance, we have never yet met with a thorough analysis of that process, considered philosophically,

ethically, and spiritually. There is no decisive test of it, for hypocrisy may deceive all but the professed subject of it, and mental blindness or the power of the Devil may prevail in the heart of one who regards himself as such a subject. Certainly that change has been claimed to have been experienced by many, and has been ecclesiastically ratified to them, when their most intimate friends have not observed in them any radical change of character; while declensions and the need of a second renewal are equally familiar and unaccountable phenomena. The famous Dr. West acknowledged that "for eight years he had attempted to preach a Saviour whom he knew not."

Whitefield, Tennent, and Brainerd were the instruments through whom the converting work was wrought upon young Hopkins, though he seems to have been long in doubt as to the fact and the method of it. After completing his college course he was a prey to religious melancholy, moody and distressed; the dream of his childhood haunted him. That any one could pass in youth through such religious experiences and not bear through life the effects of them, in a warped and diseased state of the whole spiritual nature, may be regarded as impossible. It is to be remembered, too, that this period of Hopkins's life was marked by a general ferment and distraction on the subject of religion all around him. It was the era of the "New Lights," when wandering ministers and laymen, as well as women, flushed and kindled with a sense of their special gifts, were strolling over the country to get up revivals, and were making inquisition from house to house; — as offensive, and, in the long result, as mischievous a proceeding, and as harmful to the interests of true religion, as any course of measures that could possibly be devised. Hopkins went to live and to pursue his studies with the honored and revered Edwards, then fulfilling his faithful but unpropitious ministry at Northampton. For that distinguished teacher and friend, Hopkins had a feeling but little short of veneration, and his more than filial fidelity to the memory and fame and family of that metaphysical divine is one of the most engaging traits in the character of the subject of this Memoir. But when we read of the fervor and excitement attendant upon the zealous labors of the pure-hearted Edwards in that most captivating of all the towns of New England, how dreary it is to realize the fact of the slender influence which he gained over the hearts and lives of his people! How little must there have been of the true practice of the plain, humble, faithful, Christian virtues, in a parish where such a man as Edwards could have been driven off by an ungrateful people! One would suppose that, if he had communicated the most precious elements of Christian sentiment and principle to but a few of his parishioners, such a result could not have followed.

Professor Park gives us a most graphic and beautiful sketch of the ministerial life, trials, efforts, and entire devotion of Hopkins during the twenty-five years of his labors at Great Barrington. A perfect guilelessness of heart, a lofty sense of responsibility, great humility in the estimate of his own powers and success, and the true Christian spirit of self-denial and self-consecration, were the unmistakable characteristics of the man. He showed and exercised the same heroic and Christian qualities in his longer ministry at Newport. But the outward circumstances attendant upon his ministerial life in Berkshire were peculiarly depressing. He had as hard material to work upon as ever yet fell to the lot of a New England pastor. His congregation was composed of a mixture of barbarized Dutchmen and border Yankees, and the dram-shop was a formidable opponent of his labors. The attempt to indoctrinate a set of such persons with thorough Calvinism would seem to be as hopeless as the effort to teach dancing to a rhinoceros. They must have been very hard subjects to convert, and in some respects the worse for the process. Yet with what a devoted soul the pastor labored! Not altogether either without an eye to his own security against starvation; for finding that even his meagre salary was not forthcoming, he became a very excellent farmer, and got possession of some acres, the tillage of which, we will venture to say, was not proportionately more difficult than was his strictly professional husbandry. What vivid images does Professor Park give us of the toiling country minister, now tramping through the woods to preach to the Stockbridge Indians, or to enjoy the rich treat of a conference with Edwards in the same forests; or attending Commencement at Yale; or arranging for a ride with some brother minister; or studying over the manuscripts of some polemical essay; or seeking to find, by sheer perseverance and by faith in an answer to his prayers, some channel of entrance for what he deemed the Gospel to the hearts of parishioners whose sensibilities were harder than the roads and the rocks around them.

His ministry at Newport was alike troubled and unsuccessful. He barely obtained a pastorate there; his society was always small, his strictly professional influence over them was but feeble, the Revolutionary war wellnigh terminated, when it interrupted, his labors, and there were no fruits of his work in the pulpit on which he could congratulate himself. For a rich piece of narrative, we would refer our readers to the account given in the Memoir of the "learned sermon" preached by Dr. Stiles at the installation of Mr. Hopkins; the Doctor having made the most of his intimacy with the Jewish Rabbis of Newport to get up as pedantic a sermon as was probably ever preached. The

Memoir appears to aim at great fidelity in representing the character and course of Hopkins. He was blunt, rigid, inflexible, and uncompromising; yet his benevolence was of the largest and noblest sort, of the profoundest depth, and of the broadest range. He was an eminent philanthropist, a leader in the opposition to slavery and the slave-trade, — though his own friends and neighbors were so interested against his zeal, — an advocate and a most laborious agent of African colonization, and a man whose slender resources were ungrudgingly bestowed for every good work.

Dr. Hopkins was constitutionally despondent, and looked to the dark side. "His ministerial success was in edifying saints, more than in converting sinners." Had we space for any deliberate criticism of the system of doctrines which he embraced, and to which, as a modification of Calvinism, his own name was attached as a distinctive epithet, we should aim to show that the system is entirely of human origin and invention; a complete perversion of the Gospel scheme; utterly inconsistent with common sense, with good reason, with the attributes of God and the nature of man; wholly without power to accomplish the purpose at which Christianity aims; and, in fine, a self-destructive, a repulsive, and an abominable system. There is not a page of the author's doctrinal writings which can bear the test of Scripture or reason. Take the sentence, "For he did hate and abhor himself." Suppose we ask, What is *that* in a man that thus hates and abhors something else in him? What is that *in him* which thus sits in judgment upon the remaining elements of himself? Or take a question which Hopkins puts to himself in his Journal (Memoir, p. 26), "How can I long for holiness unless I am in some measure sanctified?" What can we make of these questions in consistency with Hopkins's system?

He says in his System of Doctrines (p. 37), that the origin of the difference and opposition of opinion that have taken place among professing Christians, respecting the doctrines of Christianity, is their different and opposite notions of the character and perfections of God. And why should we not ascribe as much influence to differences of opinion concerning the nature of man? In what bald, crude, and unintelligible terms does he assert the doctrine of the Trinity: "The Scriptures teach us that there are three in this one God. Not three Gods, for this would be a contradiction; but that this Infinite Being exists in such a manner, as to be three distinct substances or persons, and yet but one God." (p. 62.) Now the writer must have been aware that no possible idea can be formed of any such division of one being into three persons. There is no need of arguing the point. The statement is flat nonsense, and any

man in his senses ought to be ashamed to advance it. But if he allows himself to talk or write in that way, we must protest against his prefacing the remark with the assertion, that "the Scriptures teach" it, for there certainly is no *teaching* in the doctrine. That Dr. Hopkins could avail himself of the liberty of explaining Scripture language as figurative when it suited his purpose to do so, is evident from his positive tone in the following sentence: "The Scriptures, indeed, speak of God as repenting that he had made man, and being grieved at his heart, which when spoken of man denote uneasiness and pain; but these expressions concerning God cannot reasonably be understood as meaning any such thing." And why not? we might ask. Surely, if Hopkins's view of the nature and destiny of man be true, there is reason enough why God should *repent*, in the most literal sense of the word, of having created such a being. Our author speaks of Satan — the title, be it remembered, was applied by our Saviour to Peter — as if he had a knowledge of his intellectual, as well as of his moral character. "Satan has no moral goodness, has no wisdom. He does not discern and propose any good end, but the contrary; and is devising and pursuing methods to accomplish his evil designs. Therefore, however clear and right his speculations may be in some instances, and though he may be very subtle and cunning, he has no wisdom, and no true discerning in things of a moral nature; but all his proposals, designs, and pursuits are directly the reverse of wisdom." (p. 44.) Now if Satan has really done but the half of that which Hopkins's system ascribes to his agency, — if he has circumvented the plans of God, and turned to evil what the Creator pronounced "good," and is sure at last of the majority of human beings as his trophies, — he has indeed shown a marvellous talent which is scarcely distinguishable from wisdom, however poor the use to which he has put it. We can sympathize with the opinion of the Rev. Dr. Chauncy of Boston, as reported by Dr. Stiles, in whose diary we read the following: "I received a letter from Dr. Chauncy, in which he asks an account of the two negroes intended [by Mr. Hopkins] for the African mission. He thinks a white missionary ought to go with them, and should not be educated by Mr. H —; for he thinks that the negroes had better continue in Paganism than embrace Mr. H —'s scheme, which he judges far more blasphemous." (Memoir, p. 133.) Dr. Chauncy was one of those Massachusetts ministers whom Hopkins called "awfully sunken creatures." (Memoir, p. 130.) We may add his own religious self-estimate: "My life and character, and all my exercises, are stained with such an awful degree of moral depravity and pollution, that I feel myself infinitely far from any righteousness

or moral goodness that can recommend me to the favor of God ; and if I am dealt with according to my moral character and desert, I must be cast off by God, and made miserable for ever." (Memoir, p. 113.) In this sentence Hopkins either unveils an awful degree of hypocrisy in himself, in the profession which he had made of entire consecration to the will and the service of God ; or else he ascribes to our Heavenly Father, as revealed by Christ, an unrelenting hideousness of ferocity which belongs to no false god of Paganism. The common infirmities which remain after an entire consecration of the life to God *cannot* be regarded as *deserving* the doom of an everlasting woe.

The three volumes before us take their place in a series of republications, or collections, of the works of the old worthies of New England. The enterprise is a part of an earnest and vigorous, and, we must add, hopeless effort, to reinstate here the lost power of Calvinism. But the spell of that religious system has been for ever broken. There is a grateful tribute paid in this enterprise to men who personally were worthy of high regard. Those who now claim to hold the faith which they held may have a right to avail themselves of all the rugged and laborious piety of their predecessors. But is there no risk that the reproduction of an old standard of doctrine will show how widely those who profess to come nearest to it have in fact departed from it?

Life of ROGER WILLIAMS, the Earliest Legislator and True Champion for a Full and Absolute Liberty of Conscience. By ROMEO ELTON, D. D., F. R. P. S. Providence : George H. Whitney. 1853. 16mo. pp. 173.

ANOTHER Life of the founder of the Colony of Rhode Island ; and, bating a qualification, the grounds of which we shall proceed to state, a very good Life of him.

Our historians and annalists are constantly congratulating us that our "beginnings" are founded on veritable and trustworthy records, and on well-established verities, eschewing all that is fabulous and misleading. This is a fact. We hope that the assertion may always remain true. And that it may continue to distinguish our annals, our historians and biographers must be exceedingly careful to practise a rigid impartiality in the relation of some very interesting, but easily pervertible, incidents and stories of our earliest colonial history. There bids fair to be two *myths* in our annals, if great caution is not practised. One of these *myths* is gathering around the story of Roger Williams ; the other, around the story of "the Quaker pe are concerned here only with the former.

And let us declare at once, and decisively, that we have no abatement to suggest from that lofty and just renown, that proud and glorious and pure distinction, which belongs to Roger Williams as an early, though not the *first*, assertor of liberty of conscience. Henry Jacob, the minister of the first Congregational church in England, published a book in 1609, advocating unlimited religious toleration, thus anticipating Williams, and making him the second public defender of that noble principle. That fame justly belongs to Williams, and though in the first part of his New England life he seems to have forgotten that other persons had consciences, his trespasses upon the rights of others were confined to words. Nor do we intend to detract in the slightest degree from the praise which attaches to his sweetness of temper, to his single-hearted disinterestedness, to his magnanimity in loving those who, as he believed, had dealt harshly by him. Take him for all in all, he was one of the most amiable and excellent of men, — one of the most saintly of the New England stock. We will go any lengths with his eulogists in extolling his virtues, his sacrificing, patient, friendly character, and his entire devotedness to some of the noblest ends for which a human being can live.

But still we affirm that there is a risk lest there shall grow up a *myth* about Roger Williams. There is just that air of romance, that spirit of exaggeration, that haze of indistinctness, about some of the incidents of his history, and just such a perplexity in the issues opened between him and many of his contemporaries, as is most favorable to the growth of the fabulous around the true. We think, in a word, that Roger Williams is praised, and is presented in the hue of romance, somewhat at the expense of others; and that there is such a temptation and facility for the slight misinterpretation of a few very important facts, that the result is a growing error in the popular view of his career. Never were two sweeter spirits encased in mortal clay than were those of John Winthrop and John Cotton; and though their alleged ill-treatment of Roger Williams is accounted to their guiltless mistake as to the just claims of conscience, we must nevertheless regard as a mythical relation whatever narrative leaves unjustified the conduct of those excellent men in this particular, or ascribes to them one whit less of forbearance, or magnanimity, or wisdom, than is claimed for Roger Williams. The simple truth is, that, if they confounded religion and politics, he confounded certain civil matters with his conscientiousness as to matters of faith. He was something beside a heretic in their eyes. It was well that he vindicated the largest tolerance, for he certainly needed it in his own course.

In the first place, Roger Williams was an *intruder* into the

Colony of Massachusetts. According to the fair view of facts, he had really no more right to come upon this soil, and to interest himself in the doings of that joint-stock company who were establishing themselves here, than he would have had to have gone unasked on board of the vessel which brought Winthrop and his companions over sea, and claimed a berth and a free passage, and interfered with the captain, and disputed the regulations of the voyagers. That he was at first welcomed here, that the colonists were glad to have him among them, and were ready and eager to avail themselves of his zeal and piety, does not alter the fact that he came into a place of which others, at great cost, and by personal sacrifices, and by agreements mutually risking their property and subjecting themselves to each other's surveillance and good or bad conduct, had exclusive possession. Nor does the fact that the Colonists expected to receive newcomers who were not original parties to their enterprise, and that they even invited such to transport themselves hither, at all justify any trespass upon their principles; for they of course designed to enforce these upon all who should join them.

This fact seems to us to offer the key, and indeed a justification, of the whole course pursued by the magistrates of Massachusetts towards Roger Williams. The idea that the trading company who planted the Bay Colony intended to open a free harborage and asylum for all sorts of discontented, erratic, or enterprising strollers from the Old World, and to allow them at their coming a vote in any matters which touched their own vested rights and peculiar institutions, is a simple absurdity. What would be thought of a person who should force himself into one of our Shaker societies, demanding a home, a vote in their affairs, and a liberty of denouncing their church principles? Roger Williams, in the essential, practical view of his case, did just this. Now let it be understood that we are not commending the method of action adopted by our fathers; we are not approving their union of Church and State; we are not vindicating the wisdom of their institutions; we are simply stating the facts of the case. They considered that they had the same right to an absolute control of all their affairs within the territory defined by their "patent," as one of our manufacturing corporations, or one of the aforesaid Shaker societies, claims in the administration of its own interests.

Mr. Williams arrived here in February, 1631. He was banished from the jurisdiction of Massachusetts in 1635, for sedition and defamation, according to the record of his sentence. In the interval he had preached at Salem and at Plymouth. With all his gentleness and sincerity of spirit, and all his unquestioned purity of purpose, he was nevertheless so scrupulous, or

factions, or irritating in his conscientiousness, that he was a cause of constant heart-burning and annoyance to those who were charged with the administration of affairs, at a time when harmony was all-essential. He certainly was a disturber of the public peace, a heady, opinionated, and most troublesome person, and at first he was unjust in his opposition to the fair rights of others. So that, besides being an intruder, he was a seditious person. No one, we think, can read the letters which the excellent Cotton addressed to him, and fail to be convinced that Williams pursued here a most irritating course. "Aged Mr. Brewster [of Plymouth] had warned the whole church of the danger of his spirit." Many were "the jealousies which generally the judicious sort of Christians had conceived of his self-conceited and unquiet and uplambelike spirit." He questioned the king's patent, by which the Colonists held their dominion, asserting that only the natives could grant such dominion, and thus he struck at the very foundations of civil government, and of all the rights of property here. It was not pretended that the English royal charter annulled the rights of the natives, for the Colonists respected these by purchasing their land; but that it gave precedence over all other foreign claims, and over all grants that might emanate from the same source. Williams himself afterwards went to England to obtain precisely the same sort of a charter for his own colony. Then he denounced and excommunicated the church at Boston, because it would not make a public declaration of repentance for having been in communion with the Church of England. Plymouth Colony was not obnoxious to either of these scruples of his, for it had no "patent," and was settled by "Separatists," but he was no more happy in his spirit there. Again, he complained of a "Hireling Ministry." And why not of a *hireling magistracy*? Our historian, Mr. Bancroft, thinks that Williams made a very smart answer in this controversy about the tax for ministers. "What," asked the magistrate, "is not the laborer worthy of his hire?" "Yes," replied Williams, "from those that hire him!" Now, unfortunately for the pith and pertinency of this answer, the Colonists had hired the ministers, and all those who sought to share the fortunes of the Colonists, of course, were pledged by the solemn contracts which the company had made with their agents and servants. The company had hired the ministers, and specimens of the contracts, under which every one who came here might be legally taxed for the support of religion, may be found in Dr. Young's invaluable volume, "The Chronicles of Massachusetts." This sort of agreement and the consequent and compulsory support of religion may have been unwise, but that did not justify "sedition." Again, Roger Wil-

liams objected to the "Freeman's Oath," by which the right of franchise was secured. But could he suppose that, after all of the Colonists had disposed of their estates in England, and had invested the proceeds in a perilous and costly enterprise here, they would allow any body and every body to vote in their affairs without exacting any conditions which would secure harmony in matters most vital, as they believed, to their success? It was not only that certain civil privileges depended upon religious conformity, but an admission to religious fellowship conferred political power, and so far involved the property of a corporation. It was not at all to the point for Williams to say that the civil and ecclesiastical powers ought to be separated. His conviction would not cover the facts of the case, nor meet its perplexity, for the civil and ecclesiastical functions *were united*, and could not be severed but by a fundamental change in the whole enterprise that had been undertaken. Certainly one who had no property in the company was not exactly the person to insist upon its disruption. Even the occasional meeting together of the ministers for social and fraternal intercourse was a matter of alarm to Mr. Williams, and he endeavored to prevent it. He instigated Endicott to remove the cross from the English banner as idolatrous; and if that act had been known in England, it might have brought a severe judgment against the Colony. The conscientious man at last excommunicated all the churches, not only of the Bay, but of Christendom, and his scruples would not allow him to hold religious services even with his own wife. Cotton Mather said of him, that "he had a windmill in his head," a remark not wholly without significance.

But the mythical or romantic air which has gathered around the history of this interesting and pure-minded man makes great account of his harsh banishment into "a wintry wilderness." Williams himself loved to refer, with a quaint and pathetic rehearsal of his experience, to this lonely and chilling fate, to which he has been supposed to have been mercilessly sentenced. But where were all the Colonists at this time? Where but in *a wilderness*? The romance and hardship of this experience lose nothing in Dr. Elton's narrative, though he afterwards incidentally remarks that Williams, in the "fourteen weeks in which he was sorely tossed, in a bitter winter season," was "probably journeying among the Indian tribes, visiting their chiefs, and adjusting matters for his permanent settlement." It is true that he started upon his pilgrimage about the middle of January, 1636 (N. S.). But this did not enter into the intention of those who had banished him. He was sentenced in November, and was allowed to remain until the next spring. In the mean while he made preparations in Salem to draw some of his friends

with him in planning a plantation at Narraganset. The Court were offended with him, because, as they thought, he abused their leniency "in venting his seditious opinions" to those who waited upon his ministry in his own house. So it was determined to send him to England in a vessel then about to sail; but when he was summoned and sought, he had taken alarm, and gone into "the wilderness." Had he been sent to England, he would have had no just cause of complaint against the magistrates, for it was evident that he could not live in civil peace with them, to say nothing of religious matters. Mr. Cotton says that, after his sentence, "some of his friends went to the place appointed by himself beforehand, to make provision of housing, and other necessities for him against his coming." "Nor did I ever see cause to doubt, but that in some cases (such as this of his was) banishment is a lawful and just punishment, if it be in proper speech a punishment at all, in such a country as this is, where the jurisdiction whence a man is banished is but small, and the country round about it large and fruitful; where a man may make his choice of variety of more pleasant and profitable seats than he leaveth behind him; in which respect banishment in this country is not counted so much a confinement as an enlargement, where a man doth not so much lose civil comforts as change them."

Roger Williams did indeed find pleasanter regions and freedom of outward action in the delightful scenes where he made a new settlement. But life was not all of a rose-color to him there. Rhode Island, being made a refuge for "all sorts of consciences," witnessed some strange doings, and the spirit of its illustrious founder was sore vexed by many troubles. He was surrounded by people whose consciences seemed to be composed of sharp angles, and people of that sort are with difficulty brought together, unless they submit to the conditions which they mutually require,—which they are not apt to do. After the fanatical Gorton had been well whipped in that colony, and banished thence, he returned, and Providence applied to Massachusetts for aid against him. Indeed Williams himself, in a letter to our General Court, expressed a conviction that, if his distracted colony were only subject to the government of this, it would be "a rich mercy." Nor did the good man find rest in his own religious conflicts. Having questioned the sufficiency of his baptism in the Church of England, he allowed a layman, Ezekiel Holliman, to repeat the rite for him in 1639, and then he performed the same service for Holliman and ten other persons. In a few months, however, he renounced this baptism, and became satisfied that all such seals and ordinances had lost their validity, and had no proper administrators on account of a general

apostasy. Yet through all his erratic experience we cannot but love the man, for he was ever estimable, devoted, and Christian in his whole walk through life.

There is some quite novel and very racy matter to be found in Dr. Elton's small volume. It consists of a correspondence between Roger Williams and Mrs. Anne Sadleir, of Stondon, England. This lady was a daughter of the famous Sir Edward Coke, who, it seems, was an early benefactor of Williams. The original manuscripts of the correspondence are in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge; the Hon. George Bancroft having informed Dr. Elton of that fact. The correspondence appears to have taken place during a visit of Williams to England in 1652-53 on the business of his colony. It began with a sweet courtesy on his part, and though at first engaged in by the lady with a tolerable grace, it was brought to a close by her in a spirit of shrewish and malignant bitterness. Williams wrote to the lady in terms of most sincere regard, expressing "the never-dying honor and respect which I owe to that dear honorable root and his branches," i. e. to Sir Edward Coke; informing her of his recent wilderness experiences, of his controversial labors, of his calm trust in God and a good conscience. At the same time he sends the lady some of his books. The daughter of his patron replies, "I have given over reading many books, and therefore, with thanks, have returned yours. Those that I now read, besides the Bible, are, first, the late king's book [Charles]; Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity; Reverend Bishop Andrews's Sermons, with his other divine meditations; Dr. Jeremy Taylor's works, and Dr. Thomas Jackson upon the Creed. Some of these my dear father was a great admirer of, and would often call them the glorious lights of the Church of England. These lights shall be my guide; I wish they may be yours: for your new lights that are so much cried up, I believe, in the conclusion, they will prove but dark lanterns; therefore I dare not meddle with them. Your friend in the old way, Anne Sadleir." In his next letter Williams acknowledges with a gentle meekness, yet with an evident opinion of his own, that her reply was "a bitter sweeting." He promises to read, and afterwards to give her his opinion of some of the books to which she refers him, and in the mean while he sends her a copy of his rejoinder to Mr. Cotton's Reply to "The Bloudy Tenent of Persecution for Cause of Conscience." The lady answers by expressing her satisfaction and glory in being a member of the Church of England, and adds, that when she looked upon the frontispiece of his book, she durst not adventure to look into it because of that word *Bloudy*, and the sad memories which it called up; so she, "with thanks," returns it. Two of her sentences are

more emphatic than true: "I cannot call to mind any blood shed for conscience. Some few that went about to make a rent in our once well-governed Church were punished, but none suffered death. But this I know, that since it has been left to every man's conscience to fancy what religion he list, there has more Christian blood been shed than was in the ten persecutions. Thus entreating you to trouble me no more in this kind, and wishing you a good journey," &c. With no loss of temper or courtesy, yet still with a mind of his own, Williams, in a lengthened reply, acknowledges her civility and gentleness. He says he does not wonder at her confidence in the books she had previously mentioned, "for all this have I done myself, until the Father of Spirits mercifully persuaded mine to swallow down no longer without chewing; to chew no longer without tasting; to taste no longer without begging the Holy Spirit of God," &c. "And as for the king's book, I knew his person, vicious, a swearer from his youth, and an oppressor and persecutor of good men," &c. "Against his and his blasphemous father's cruelties, your own dear father, and many precious men, shall rise up shortly and cry for vengeance." Entering at some length upon the matter of persecution, and with a slight sketch of a system of true divinity, the persevering writer asks the lady to read Taylor's "Liberty of Prophesying," and "Mr. Milton's answer to the king's book." But the lady has now lost her temper and become a perfect termagant, as will appear from sentences of her closing letter. "Mr. Williams, — I thought my first letter would have given you so much satisfaction, that, in that kind, I should never have heard of you any more; but it seems you have a face of brass, so that you cannot blush. For the foul and false aspersions you have cast upon that king, of ever-blessed memory, Charles the Martyr, I protest I trembled when I read them, and none but such a villain as yourself would have wrote them. For Milton's book, that you desire I should read, if I be not mistaken, that is he that has wrote a book of the lawfulness of divorce; and, if report say true, he had, at that time, two or three wives living. [!] God has begun his judgment upon him here [in blindness]; his punishment will be hereafter in hell. I believe that Bishop Laud, howsoever he be slighted, will rise a saint, when many seeming ones, such as you are, will rise devils. I will walk as directly to heaven as I can, in which place, if you will turn from being a rebel, and fear God and obey the king, there is hope I may meet you there; howsoever, trouble me no more with your letters, for they are very troublesome to her that wishes you in the place from whence you came."

This amiable lady has indorsed on one of her correspondent's epistles to her the following: — "This Roger Williams, when he

was a youth, would, in a short hand, take sermons and speeches in the Star Chamber, and present them to my dear father. He, seeing so hopeful a youth, took such liking to him that he sent him into Sutton's Hospital [now the Charter-House], and he was the second that was placed there; full little did he think that he would have proved such a rebel to God, the king, and his country. I leave his letters, that, if ever he has the face to return into his native country, Tyburn may give him welcome." It is to be hoped that the consort of Mrs. Sadleir either had no opinions on important matters, or else that they accorded with those of his lady; otherwise his marital state must have been an unquiet one.

The colony founded by Roger Williams adopted into its constitution the principle of unlimited religious freedom, providing by statute for that noble indulgence of conscience which had been enjoyed in Holland. Rhode Island, however, had been anticipated on this continent in legislation for that freedom. Leonard Calvert, Lord Baltimore, who as a Roman Catholic had been driven from Episcopal Virginia, had, in 1634, made his colony of Maryland free to all professed Christians. There is reason for believing that Rhode Island denied the right of franchise to Roman Catholics and to all persons not Christians. Judge Eddy, indeed, has labored to disprove the alleged fact, and Dr. Elton considers that he has succeeded in his attempt. Still, the matter is not cleared up. It has not been satisfactorily disproved that the General Assembly of Rhode Island, in 1663, excluded from citizenship the two classes of persons above named, and that the Assembly, in 1783, passed a statute which repealed the former one.

Let the full truth of history, as regards Roger Williams and every other prominent character in our annals, be kept inviolate. We need have no myths in our history. We have respect enough for the venerable person with whom we have been dealing, to believe that he would accept no praise which was won for him by any misrepresentation of the views of such men as Winthrop and Cotton, whom he revered and loved.

Select British Eloquence: embracing the best Speeches, entire, of the most Eminent Orators of Great Britain, for the last Two Centuries; with Sketches of their Lives, an Estimate of their Genius, and Notes, Critical and Explanatory. By CHAUNCEY A. GOODRICH, D. D., Professor in Yale College. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1852. Royal 8vo. pp. 947.

THIS substantial volume, the contents of which would fill more than half a dozen ordinary octavos, embraces materials which

might be sought in vain in any sixty volumes that could be selected from the largest library. Its wonderful compactness and the completeness of its contents insure to it a value independently of the critical uses for which its subject-matter has been improved. Professor Goodrich has here brought together the choicest specimens of British eloquence from a period of more than two hundred years. And by *specimens* we do not mean pages or passages culled after the fashion of "Elegant Extracts," disjointed fragments of speeches torn from their context, because the compiler has been struck with their rhetoric. The editor of this volume has been guilty of no such folly. The paramount excellence of the plan which he has followed lies in the fact, that he gives us whole speeches; and not only so, but also, in some cases, all the speeches of the most distinguished orators, with the omission of such matter only as hardly makes an exception to the rule. Thus we have in the volume all of Chatham's speeches, eight of which have never before been published in this country; and all of Burke's which he himself prepared for publication, except one of a merely financial character. Professor Goodrich takes the common and just estimate by which British orators are relatively arranged on the scale of distinction, and according to their rank on that scale he gives us more or less of their eloquence. His own introductory sketches, prefixed to the several matters of his volume, his biographical, historical, critical, and philosophical notes, constitute an apparatus of the highest value for the illustration of the speeches, and in fact give to his book the double character of an authentic history and an oratorical compend. Whoever owns this volume has a treasure of wealth which cannot be soon exhausted. The only blemish which we have noticed is, that the editor should have introduced a matter of sectarian controversy, or a piece of religious criticism, as, for instance, in a note to a speech of Lord Brougham's.

Footsteps of our Forefathers: what they suffered and what they sought. Describing Localities, and portraying Personages and Events, conspicuous in the Struggles for Religious Liberty. By JAMES G. MIALL. Thirty-six Illustrations by Anelay, from Sketches by the Author. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1852. 12mo. pp. 352.

WITHOUT aiming after any of the severer requisitions of thoroughness and novelty in antiquarian research, the author of this volume has evidently spared no pains to insure perfect fidelity to historic truth in all his statements. We have read his

work with a sympathizing interest. Our deeper feelings of grateful veneration towards those who bore the brunt of the conflict with the foes of an honest conscience and of a free mind, have been profoundly moved by the recital of their experience here given. We award the author the praise of the strictest impartiality. He does not commend sincerity in one form of religious belief, and distrust or impugn it in another form of belief. He does not rebuke a breach of the rights of conscience in one party, and justify it in another party. He holds the scales of candor and justice with an even hand. He is also satisfied with the effect of plain truth in his recitals, without aiming after any rhetorical artifices and one-sided appeals. The thread of his narrative unites all the honored names and all the marked incidents which enter into the great struggles of religious freedom, against ecclesiastical, political, and social tyrannies, from the era and the story of Wickliffe, to the repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts, and to the Bill for Catholic Emancipation, in 1828 and 1829. Why did he not say a word, at least, on the Dissenters' Chapels Bill, by which Unitarians are able to hold places of worship bequeathed to them by their fathers? The author's general aim is to show that a state church and the true Church are not identical; that the civil power has no right to legislate on religious matters; and that when it usurps such power, the results are, that the state wins no new security for its own peace and prosperity, and that an element of impurity, worldliness, and discord is introduced into the religious interest of a community. We would commend this volume as having a noble moral, reached and illustrated through a singularly interesting series of historical narrations. There are several pages in it, over the perusal of which the tears of true emotion will start from the eye of the reader.

The Life of BERNARD PALISSY, of Saintes, his Labors and Discoveries in Art and Science, with an Outline of his Philosophical Doctrines, and a Translation of Illustrative Selections from his Works. By HENRY MORLEY. Boston: Ticknor, Reed, & Fields. 1853. 2 vols. 16mo. pp. 303, 347.

THE beautiful story of a life related in these volumes is the most striking exemplification that has as yet fallen under our eyes of the "pursuit of knowledge under difficulties." The subject of the volumes is fresh and most inviting. It takes us entirely aside from the beaten and familiar paths of our recent literature. Lamartine, it is true, has recently treated the same subject in his style of gossamer and gewgaws of tinted dewdrops; but Mr.

Morley has done justice to it. Even the biographer's frequent digressions, which, as the reader at times has a misgiving, may be a little aside from the story, are on themes unhackneyed and novel, and contribute to the originality of the volumes. We will not enter into any details about the contents of the volumes, or give such a glimpse even of the story as will impair the pleasure which we know a reader will derive from their perusal. We would only say, that the book is a rare and felicitous contribution to literature, and that it will afford the highest delight, the most bracing instruction, and a most quickening impulse towards all that is good.

Essays and Tales in Prose. By BARRY CORNWALL. Boston : Ticknor, Reed, & Fields. 1853. 2 vols. 16mo. pp. 263, 251.

"BARRY CORNWALL" is the literary *alias* of Mr. B. W. Procter. This collection of his prose pieces is made with his own approbation by the publishers in this country, not having been anticipated in England. The author has long been esteemed as one of the most admired of living poets; and now this collection of his prose writings will, we are sure, make him known to yet more readers, who will be tempted to possess themselves of all his published works. He is a pure, a graceful, and a suggestive writer. Passages of a pathetic and serious character, occasionally tinged with gloom, might be selected from these volumes, which prove that the author has not lived merely on the surface of existence. His Essay on the Death of Friends may be profitably read by those who are in sympathy with the sad theme, and they will feel that he has touched the true chords. His Memoir and Essay on the Genius of Shakspeare, we regard as equal to that of De Quincey on the same subject, and that is high praise.

Village Life in Egypt, with Sketches of the Said. By BAYLE ST. JOHN, Author of "Two Years in a Levantine Family." Boston : Ticknor, Reed, & Fields. 1853. 2 vols. 16mo. pp. 216, 218.

MR. ST. JOHN had occasion to reside for several years in Alexandria, as the correspondent of a London newspaper, and to obtain the benefit of that peculiarly even climate. Instead of keeping amongst his countrymen at a hotel, as Englishmen commonly do, he placed himself in a Levantine family, where nothing

but Arabic was spoken, and where the customs of the better class of natives were faithfully observed. In this natural way, and by an entire mastery of the language, he obtained an insight into Egyptian life to which hardly any other traveller can pretend. With this immense advantage over common writers upon "the East," and a strong sympathy for the oppressed Fellahs, Mr. St. John mingles no little Yankee shrewdness, and a general freedom from prejudice, except in regard to hieroglyphical interpretation; so that his books are the best in present circulation whence we may obtain a spirited sketch of this most interesting country, its monuments, its agriculture, its government, above all, of its perishing common people. An ordinary journey up and down the Nile will not furnish so accurate, reliable, and extensive knowledge as this transcript of the "Village Life of Egypt." We have found none of those gross errors which disfigure other publications on the same subject, like the "Pilgrimage in Egypt," by Dr. Smith; and none of the author's information is picked up at second hand, from ignorant dragomans or hotel people, whose amusement it is to impose upon travellers.

Historical Collections of Louisiana, by B. F. FRENCH. Vol. IV. *Discovery and Exploration of the Mississippi Valley*, by JOHN GILMARY SHEA. New York: Redfield. 1852. 8vo. pp. 348.

MR. BENJAMIN F. FRENCH is known to students of American history as the author of a series of volumes containing valuable materials for the history of Louisiana, a name which in its earliest acceptation embraced the greater part of the Mississippi Valley. These documents consist of translations of manuscripts or of rare printed works, inaccessible to general readers; and the value of the whole is very much increased by the notes and illustrations of the editor, who has given himself to the work with great zeal and a most liberal spirit. The volume before us is the fourth of Mr. French's series, and is a singularly interesting collection of the principal documents relating to the discovery of the Mississippi. The most prominent among these are the journals of Father Marquette, republished, not from the imperfect edition of Thevenot, but from the original manuscripts preserved in the Hôtel Dieu of Quebec, and afterwards transferred to the keeping of Father Martin, a Jesuit, of Montreal. On Mr. French's application, these papers were placed for publication in the hands of Mr. John Gilmary Shea, a Catholic, and, as we are informed, a member of the Society of Jesus. On him, therefore, devolved the task of preparing them for the press, a task which he has executed in an admirable manner. Besides the journals of Mar-

quette, and the fac-simile of his autograph map, Mr. Shea has embodied in the volume extended extracts from Hennepin and the rare volumes of Le Clercq, besides other papers of equal interest, which have never before seen the light. His notes and observations indicate a knowledge of his subject which could have been acquired only by years of research, and the result is a mass of documentary history as authentic as it is curious and entertaining. Additional notes, we observe, have been contributed by Mr. French.

Marquette, as every one knows, was a member of that wonderful association which, combining the greatest pliancy with the greatest force, unites the most complete subordination with the highest degree of individual energy. In his earliest manhood he devoted himself to the hard and unrequited labors of the Indian missions, and before reaching middle age he had immortalized his name and closed his earthly career. His calm courage and tempered activity seem to have been free from every touch of ambition, and his name reflects honor, not only on the order of the Jesuits, but on human nature.

The proceeds of the sales of this book are to be devoted to the construction of a monument to Marquette. Bancroft's prediction, that the people of the West would do this final honor to his memory, is not, it seems, to be verified.

The Works of JOHN ADAMS, Second President of the United States: with a Life of the Author, Notes and Illustrations, by his Grandson, CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS. Boston: Little, Brown, & Co. 1851, 1852. Vols. VI. and VII. 8vo. pp. 550, 675.

THESE two elegant volumes, instalments of a work which, when completed, will be one of the most valuable sources of American history, contain matter of much interest to all persons who love any thing solid and wise. We think that the publication of President Adams's Works will present to American readers of this and the following generations such an idea of his noble patriotism, of his sound good sense, and of his marked abilities, as will exalt him to a very high place among the worthies of the land. The sixth volume continues his Works on Government, the Defence of our Constitution, Discourses on Davila, a Review of Mr. Hillhouse's Propositions for amending the Constitution, and Letters having reference to all these subjects. The seventh volume is filled with a most rich collection of Letters, Messages, and Public Documents, the Correspondence of Mr.

Adams with public and distinguished men all over Christendom, illustrated and explained, wherever necessary, by the painstaking research of the editor.

History of the United States, from the Discovery of the American Continent. By GEORGE BANCROFT. Boston: Little, Brown, & Co. 1852. Vol. V. 8vo. pp. 459.

MR. BANCROFT entitles the period of Revolutionary history which he treats in this volume, "Epoch Second," and the title which he gives to its chronicle is, "How Great Britain estranged America." That title is, indeed, the appropriate designation of the series of arbitrary measures devised by the English government for irritating and exasperating her colonies on this continent. When she herself was manifestly bent upon reaping where she had not sown, and instituted those oppressive exactions to which Englishmen on any soil could not submit, she roused a spirit which, in its turn, was doubtless aggravating, if not insulting, to the mother country. Mr. Bancroft has completely mastered all the details of the issue, and his power of generalizing and grouping, his philosophical skill, and his power over language, enable him to tell the story as it ought to be told, — faithfully, thoroughly, and in a way to chain the attention of the reader. His successive volumes will extend and elevate his fame.

Memoirs, Journal, and Correspondence of THOMAS MOORE. Edited by the Right Honorable LORD JOHN RUSSELL, M. P. London: Longmans. Boston: Little, Brown, & Co. 1852. Vols I. and II. 12mo. pp. 372, 358.

THE privilege of possessing these volumes — the first two of the eight in which the work will be comprised — at an American price, though in the London edition, is one of the fruits of the arrangement made by the Boston with the English publishers, to which we referred in our last number. The result is that we have, for a dollar and a quarter a volume, a work for which English readers pay two dollars and a half a volume. We certainly cannot object to the arrangement, and we think that the foreign publishers will find their account in it. Lord John Russell, late the Premier of Great Britain, was designated for the labor of love which he here performs, by the will of the author of the *Irish Melodies* and *Lalla Rookh*. He has discharged his office with a modesty that keeps himself in the shade. The poet left rich

materials for the work, in an autobiographical sketch, a journal, and abundant letters. These the editor has published, with such incidental illustrations as they need. He introduces them with a very brief sketch of the poet's life and character, and a generous criticism of his genius, giving him high praise for his affectionate nature and for the fidelity of his friendship. The editor does not choose to enter into any defence or palliation of those productions of the poet which have sullied the purity of his fame. The volumes give us some delightful gossip reading and occasional matters of much higher interest.

Woman's Record; or Sketches of all Distinguished Women, from "The Beginning" till A. D. 1850. Arranged in Four Eras. With Selections from Female Writers of every Age. By SARAH JOSEPHA HALE. Illustrated by Two Hundred and Thirty Portraits, engraved on Wood, by Lossing and Barritt. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1853. Royal 8vo. pp. 904.

THIS is a book which we must *notice* without having read it; therefore we must, in candor, say nothing but what is kindly of it. To that rule we confine ourselves, with the simple qualification of affirming that the word *all* had better not be retained in the title; first, because in the nature of things it cannot be verified, and second, because we have looked through the book for the names of some "distinguished women," and have not found them. The volume will be a perfect armory of weapons, or rather of arguments, for those who are interested in "the woman question," and a cursory examination of it has reminded us that its arguments may be turned to both sides of the great issue now pending among philanthropists. If the size and the crowded contents of the volume do not frighten a reader, and they ought not to do so in these days, it will afford amusement, pleasure, instruction, and many wise and holy counsels. It traverses the whole history of the world. It deals with some of the noblest characters of our race. It exhibits research in its structure, and the high reputation of the authoress gives assurance of the fidelity with which she has performed her enormous undertaking.

Memoir of MARY L. WARE, Wife of Henry Ware, Jr. By EDWARD B. HALL. Boston: Crosby, Nichols, & Co. New York: Charles S. Francis & Co. 12mo. pp. 434.

WE took up this book with high expectations, and they have been more than answered. It lays before us the outward history,

and with it the inward life, of as pure, as devout, as disinterested, and as perfect a woman as it has ever been our privilege to know. There was a great deal of variety in her external condition, though it all fell within the sphere which the most fastidious in such matters will recognize as appropriate to her sex. But that which gives value to the Memoir is the spirit in which she met every new exigency as it came up, and the quiet power, whether of action or endurance, with which she went through all the changes and trying emergencies of a changing and eventful life. Mrs. Ware had very decided religious opinions, which she valued beyond all price. But she was eminently practical and devout. She lived in those religious thoughts, affections, and devotions which lie too deep to be disturbed by theological doubts or discussions, and in those beneficent acts which outrun all theological distinctions, and commend themselves alike to Christians of every name. There are in her life passages of exquisite beauty and pathos. No one ever enjoyed more. Her love of nature would have been a passion had not her love of duty been still stronger. There is no exhibition of intellectual strength, but she is always equal to the occasion, and this, considering the wide range of her experience, is as strong evidence as can be given of a superior mind. Scattered along on the pages of this volume will be found words of wisdom adapted to almost every situation, and, though uttered in the confidence of private friendship or with reference only to particular cases, they will be found to constitute as complete and as valuable a treatise on female culture and female duties, in their most extended sphere, as can be found in any work on the subject, while the beauty of her example throws its warm radiance over her modest and unpretending precepts. As a daughter, as a single woman left alone in the world, as a wife and mother, as at the head of a parish, or an influential member of a refined and intellectual society, attending to all its varied duties, as the centre of a generous and enlarged hospitality, as a widow with seven fatherless children looking up to her, when with failing health she was thrown back upon her own resources, with all a woman's feeling of loneliness and weakness, as a Christian everywhere, with a faith that never faltered, and a benevolence that never grew weary, she was, beyond all the women whom we have known, the one whom we should rejoice to hold up as a model to her sex. And we rejoice that her life is here given in so unexceptionable and so attractive a form. Her words and her deeds can have power only for good. To have lived near her, in the daily interchange of kind wishes and kind acts, down to the last day of her life, was one of the richest privileges that we have known. We can well understand the feelings in that obscure English hamlet, to which she had come as an angel from heaven to watch and

labor and pray with sufferers, during the prevalence of a terrible disease, where they used to speak of her as "the good lady," and look upon her as "a superior being," and where, when she took her leave of them, "the whole village, young and old, came out in a body, and escorted her on her way."

Dr. Hall has done his part of the work well, and those who knew and loved Mrs. Ware will thankfully receive it as a true portrait. The account of her early years may be too minute, and, being the least interesting part of the book, may deter indifferent and careless readers from going farther. Perhaps the fastidiousness shown in the suppression of names is excessive. But we have no heart to criticize a work which we have read with such interest and satisfaction.

Narrative and Miscellaneous Papers. By THOMAS DE QUINCEY. Boston: Ticknor, Reed, & Fields. 1853. 2 vols. 16mo. pp. 280, 302.

WE have now nine volumes of the writings of this eminent and scholarly author. Those who appreciate his works must feel indebted to the Boston publishers, who have been at the pains to gather them together from the reviews, magazines, and other repositories, through which for a long series of years they have been distributed. We have spoken in high praise of the literary value of the previous volumes, and we have now to add, that there are papers in these which we have read with new admiration of the genius of the author. His learning is used to illustrate the highest themes of truth, whether in nature, in experience, or in the philosophy of the human heart, in which last science he has a skill of his own.

The First Epistle of John, practically explained. By DR. AUGUSTUS NEANDER. Translated from the German by MRS. H. C. CONANT. New York: Lewis Colby. 1852. 16mo. pp. 319.

A FINE vein of Christian sentiment, qualified by the merest shadow and semblance of orthodoxy, runs through this work of Neander. If we should find any fault with it, it would be on the score of its diffusiveness and repetition. There is hardly enough of thought, or logical truth, or intellectual force in it, to fill out its sometimes slightly wearisome dilation upon a few sentiments. Still, the author has caught the spirit of the Master, and we thank the accomplished translator for having so faithfully and beautifully rendered his work into English.

My Life and Acts in Hungary in the Years 1848 and 1849.

By ARTHUR GÖRGEI. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1852.
12mo. pp. 616.

WE have not a sufficiently extensive or accurate knowledge of the perplexed story of the Hungarian Revolution, to qualify us for the criticism of this volume. Its publication has been looked to with interest, because of the attempts to suppress it, and on account of the prominent position of the writer and the vexed issue between him and Kossuth. We announce the book, that our readers may avail themselves of the information and the interest which it may impart.

Speeches on the Legislative Independence of Ireland. With Introductory Notes. By THOMAS FRANCIS MEAGHER. New York: Redfield. 1853. 12mo. pp. 317.

THIS book will be valued in our community, rather for the facts which it directly or indirectly relates concerning the actual social condition of the Irish, than for the inflammatory rhetoric of the agitation arising from that condition. There are burning words used for the statement of appalling and saddening truths. The speeches of Meagher furnish some admirable specimens of an exciting oratory.

Cornelius Nepos, with Notes, Historical and Explanatory. By CHARLES ANTHON, LL. D. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1852. 12mo. pp. 396.

As usual, the editor gives twice as much space to "Notes," as is covered by the text which he illustrates. He will always receive for this form of generosity the thanks of pupils who use his manuals. We are expecting to hear from New York of the dedication of an edifice to be called the "Anthon Library"; for if the learned and laborious editor continues to produce his volumes with the rapidity and the facility which have recently distinguished his name, a building will be requisite to contain his works.

Elements of Geology. By ALONZO GRAY, A. M., and C. B. ADAMS, A. M. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1853. 12mo. pp. 354.

THESE two gentlemen have a high reputation, and by their united labors they have presented Geology in a simple and intelligible way, imparting, too, all the information upon the subject which most persons, pupils or common searchers after truth, will care to possess.

The Trinity, in its Theological, Scientific, and Practical Aspects, analyzed and illustrated. By DR. M. EDGEWORTH LAZARUS. New York: Fowlers & Wells. 1851. 8vo. pp. 67 and 50.

A HETEROGENEOUS and extremely strange work. Its lack of originality and of practical value should have prevented its publication. We sympathize with the author in most of his aspirations, but abhor his style, which is compacted with the perfections of all literary faults.

The Standard Speaker for Schools, Academies, and Colleges. By EPES SARGENT. 8vo. pp. 558. — *Selections in Poetry for Exercises at School and at Home.* Edited by EPES SARGENT. 12mo. pp. 336. — Philadelphia: Thomas, Cowperthwait, & Co. 1852.

THESE works have been prepared with great care and skill. A discriminating taste, a thorough familiarity with the subjects, together with high literary qualifications of every kind in the editor, have combined to make the volumes all that could be desired for their respective purposes. We most cordially commend them.

SEVERAL new books of more or less value and interest have recently been issued, which demand of us a passing notice. Messrs. Crosby, Nichols, & Co. have stereotyped that admirable work, "The Eclipse of Faith." A large edition of it which they had issued was soon exhausted, and the book, having won favor among all religious denominations, may be considered as sure of a very wide and permanent circulation. The publishers have in press a volume of "Miscellanies" by the same author. — The same firm have reprinted, as announced in our last number, the striking little book called "Reminiscences of Thought and Feeling." From several persons who have read it, we have received confirmations of our own opinion of it, as a work aside from the common track, and eminently suggestive in its contents. — A volume on Hebrew Lyrical History, by Thomas Bulfinch, is published by the same firm. We had prepared a notice of it, but it is crowded out from this number.

The almost absorbing theme among us recently has been the death of Daniel Webster. Every thing relating to the character and the career of the eminent statesman is sought with avidity. The Messrs. Appleton, of New York, have issued, in two volumes of their admirable Popular Library, an authentic sketch of his life, with most interesting memorials of him. These are pre-

pared by Gen. S. P. Lyman, whose intimate relations with Mr. Webster have eminently qualified him for the work he has undertaken. The volumes are worthy of wide circulation, and will enchain the attention of the reader. — We may mention here, that three pleasant volumes from the pen of Mr. Thackeray have recently been reproduced in this Popular Library, entitled respectively, "A Shabby Genteel Story," "Confessions of Fitz-Boodle," and "Men's Wives," the last being, as we think, by far the best. The presence of the author on this side of the sea, and the interest which has been exhibited in his lectures, will extend the circle of his readers. — A second series of "Essays from the London Times," filled with fresh and racy matter, forms yet another volume of the "Popular Library."

The Messrs. Harper, of New York, have published "The Private Life of Daniel Webster," by Charles Lanman. The writer, as the private secretary and intimate companion of Mr. Webster, has availed himself of his opportunities in those relations to impart much delightful information, without trespassing upon an improper use of confidence or familiarity.

Messrs. Gould & Lincoln have published "Philip Doddridge, his Life and Labors. A Centenary Memorial. By John Stoughton. With an Introductory Chapter by James G. Miall." As the title implies, this is a commemorative sketch, designed as a grateful tribute to one of the most devoted and excellent of the non-conformist divines of England. He was worthy for whom this service is done.

"The World's Laconics; or the Best Thoughts of the Best Authors. By Everard Berkeley. In Prose and Poetry. With an Introduction by William B. Sprague, D. D." — is the title of an instructive volume, crowded with wise and beautiful counsels and thoughts. Published by M. W. Dodd, of New York.

Messrs. Ticknor, Reed, & Fields, of Boston, have published a most agreeable volume of "English Tales and Sketches," by Mrs. Newton Crossland. This esteemed authoress may be known to some of our readers by her "Lydia, a Woman's Book."

The fruitful press of Redfield, of New York, is ever busy on works of amusement or information. Three of his recent publications, which will find admirers in different circles, are, "The Chevaliers of France, from the Crusaders to the Marechals of Louis XIV.," by Henry William Herbert; "The Children of Light, a Theme for the Time," by Caroline Chesebro'; and "Cap Sheaf, a Fresh Bundle," by Lewis Myrtle.

C. S. Francis & Co., of New York, have published a most attractive-looking volume, entitled "The Canadian Crusoes." The fact that a younger reader has for the present monopolized the

volume, prevents our being able to pronounce upon the merits of the volume from a perusal of it, though the fact gives an indirect testimony in behalf of the book from one of that class of humanity for which it is designed.

Of other books for the young, we would mention "Aunt Effie's Rhymes for Little Children," and "The Doll and her Friends," both published by Ticknor, Reed, & Fields; and "The Pretty Plate," published by Redfield.

INTELLIGENCE.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

The North British Review on the Inspiration of the Bible. — The North British Review takes a rank second to neither of the great quarterly reviews which are now the exponents of the highest literary, scientific, philosophical, and theological talent in Great Britain. Nominally, the theology of the North British is Calvinistic; but even those articles in which we should expect to find the strongest tokens of that element are characterized by a freedom from it, not to say by an inconsistency with it, which often surprises us. If we were necessarily restricted to the perusal of but one of the quarterlies, we should surely choose the North British; for there is a breadth of view, a vigor, and a generosity of spirit in its greatest articles, which, taken in connection with the influence of a profoundly religious aim and tone, make its essays eminently healthful to mind and heart.

In the number of this Review for November, 1852, we find a most able and a very opportune article on the "Infallibility of the Bible and Recent Theories of Inspiration." As a whole, the piece is deserving of the highest praise for the thoroughness and good sense of its own argument, and for the candor with which it states, and the unevasive way in which it disposes of some theories which it pronounces untenable. The writer, certainly, has a difficult task in hand, were it confined to a mere statement of the antagonistic theories, with their various shadings and qualifications, which have been proposed on the subject here discussed. He, however, works his way on through large generalizations, when they are possible, and with an occasional dealing with particulars, when that is essential to his design. He begins with stating three propositions, which, as he asserts, sum up the orthodoxy of the fathers, amid many minor diversities and modifications on the subject of our sacred books: — *First*, that they embody a Divine Revelation; *secondly*, that they exhaust that Revelation; and, *thirdly*, that they contain it in a form of absolute purity. To the truth of these three propositions the writer glories in giving in his cordial adherence, as unimpaired by any attacks recently made upon them or left undefended by any indecisiveness in the replies given by believers in them to the objections of those who have impugned them. But he wisely suggests, that

mere assertion on such an issue will not now avail. We have no *personal inspiration* by which we can assure ourselves, and still less by which we can convince a doubter, of the infallibility of the Bible. The study of all sides of the question is requisite. The writer aims to present a birdseye view of the subject. He begins by excluding from the field on which the contest is to be tried that class of modern sceptical writers who come into one side of it under false pretences; who deceive us by using the word *inspiration* as equivalent to *elevated genius*, and who thus appear to be testing the authority of the Bible, while they have already prejudged against it. He urges several complaints against these writers. First, they profess to weigh the alleged evidence of revelation as a *supernatural system embodied in writings*, while they have previously made up their minds that no amount or weight or kind of evidence can establish *any* miracle or supernatural communication. Secondly, by an obstinate misreading of the contents of the Bible, they suppress and turn the other way all the internal evidence which the Bible offers of its own inspiration. And, once more, they treat the positive external evidence of the Bible in an unauthorized and arbitrary manner. These three complaints against the "critical" school are, as we think, sustained with much cogency; while the misleading, fluctuating, and inconsistent course of those against whom they are urged is well exposed. Mr. Newman and Mr. Greg are especially chargeable with an abuse of language, with a confusion of ideas, and with the strangest inconsistency of sentiments. Alternate pages of their writings contain the loftiest expressions of reverence and admiration for Scripture, and assertions utterly destructive of any confidence which could be reposed in it. Mr. Newman says, that "Judea was a well-spring of religious wisdom to a world besotted by frivolous or impure fancies"; and yet he affirms that its sacred books are only lies, or forged oracles. This is a strange "combination of kissing and smiting under the fifth rib." Mr. Greg, after impugning in many places the originality, the intelligence, the wisdom, the credibility, and the sanity of Jesus, gravely assures us, in other passages of his "Creed of Christendom," that Jesus was "the wisest, purest, noblest being that ever clothed thought in the poor language of humanity"; and that he was "the most exalted religious genius whom God ever sent upon the earth, — in himself an embodied revelation." If ever the moral of the old Hebrew oracle of the confusion of tongues at Babel, incident upon an attempted union in a plotting of men against God, has had an evident illustration in later experience, the discordancy of the "critical school" is a most striking instance of it.

The writer then passes to the ranks of the "Supernaturalists," by whom alone, as he justly affirms, theories of "inspiration" can with any propriety of speech be entertained. There is a common ground between them, but on the borders of it we find two theories recognized; one is that of a *partial* inspiration, the other is that of a *plenary* inspiration. Schleiermacher and Coleridge are taken as the most influential reasoners on the former theory. The somewhat mystical and inconsistent view of Schleiermacher is fairly presented, and the palpable weaknesses of it are kindly exposed. The school which he formed, embracing such men as Nitzsch, Julius Müller, Twisten, and Tholuck, with Neander at the head of it, while admitting the fundamental principles of

Schleiermacher, modified them to such an extent in their application, as essentially to vary the rules of criticism on which they proceed. The modifications of the theory of *partial* inspiration are fairly stated by the Reviewer, and he candidly presents the strength of the position assumed by the more distinguished advocates of it. But we do not think that he succeeds in invalidating the general grounds on which that theory, under some of the modifications already announced, or possibly under some yet to be defined, may be sustained. He does not go into an argument in this article for the defence of his own theory of *plenary* inspiration. He does not even make as full a statement of it as we should be glad to have from him; but contents himself, for the most part, with that indirect assurance which it wins from his having crippled, as he thinks, every support of the alternative theory. He makes the INFALLIBILITY of the Bible the capital article of his faith. The specific abatements which he seems inclined to grant are such as may be ascribed to "the necessary brevity of narration, the occupation of different points of view, the neglect of chronological details." But with an inconsistency for which we were not prepared in such a writer, he adds to the mention of the foregoing this suggestion: "And many other circumstances may surely be supposed to have given a discordant aspect to some parts of Scripture from the beginning. Nor is it an evasion, but a perfectly honorable solution, to ascribe some considerable portion of the alleged phenomena [those which are thought to indicate a *partial* inspiration] to accidents of transcription." Now we regret to have to say, that there is something in these two sentences which does look like an "evasion." There is a looseness in that clause, "many other circumstances"; and "accidents of transcription" will cover a great deal of controverted matter. The question between the advocates of the two leading theories of inspiration is not, as we take it, whether, when the pages of the Bible came from the pens of the writers, the pages were *infallible*; but whether *the Bible as we now have it is infallible*. If the Reviewer is to be allowed to stretch the compass of the conditional causes of seeming defects to any length and breadth which he may please, he may be able to embrace within them, and so to explain by them, all those phenomena which his opponents think they are accounting for at least as honestly by referring them to an incomplete inspiration. We certainly will not condemn the Reviewer because, as he affirms, want of space compels him to stop without a full exposition of the points which he ought chiefly to have elaborated. We hope that he will resume his theme, if only to define the limits within which he will allow the causes of apparent imperfection in the Bible, or the signs of unassisted, and therefore fallible, human agency, to have wrought. This is a question vital to his own theory, for, as he leaves the matter, he yields the ground on which we are wont to allow that every statement in our Bible is not infallible. We have, for instance, three accounts of St. Paul's conversion in the Book of Acts. In one of these it is distinctly asserted, that those who were with him "heard the voice" that spoke to him; in another of the accounts it is as distinctly asserted that they did not hear it. Is there an error of *transcription* here? The discrepancy is not of the slightest consequence, as bearing upon Christian faith and duty. But still it is a discrepancy, and is to be accounted for. Our Reviewer has his way, or rather his ways, of accounting for all the imperfections of the written word, from Genesis to Revelation, in consistency with

his belief in the *plenary* inspiration. We apprehend that there are many persons who profess to believe only in a *partial* inspiration, as defined by him, that will be ready to adopt his theory, if he will give them the privilege to apply, according as they may judge necessary, the principles which he feels compelled to admit for his own satisfaction.

The Bible in Maynooth. — This is the title of a somewhat remarkable article in the Dublin Review for October, 1852. The Royal College of St. Patrick, at Maynooth, as most of our readers are aware, is a Roman Catholic institution in Ireland, which receives an annual pecuniary grant from the British Parliament. This public patronage, extended by a Protestant realm to an heretical seminary, is one of the anomalies of a church and state legislation. The zealots against Popery, as well as a large class of milder persons who value consistency as a principle, are in the habit of constantly agitating the question, whether government ought not to withdraw its patronage from Maynooth. The writer of the article before us is turning to some account the recent publication of an elementary Introduction to the Scriptures, by Dr. Dixon, a Professor in the College. The occasion is improved for a justification of the policy of the Roman Church in depriving her disciples of the Bible, and for the positive denial that we Protestants have any right to its possession. "We must deny to Protestantism any right to use the Bible, much more to interpret it," says the writer. Protestants "can prove neither its canon, its inspiration, nor its primary doctrines, except through that very authority which they are questioning." It would seem from this statement that the Roman Church has a monopoly of all the historic evidences and processes by which a document is authenticated, and is the only channel through which any information concerning the past can be conveyed down to the present. The writer then gives a most melancholy account of the risks which attend the free use of the Bible, and of the disastrous consequences of its popular and unguarded circulation. He seems to be wholly unaware, that precisely the same consequences may be attached to the public dissemination of the doctrines and principles of his own Church. Among Protestants, the Bible, he says, "is the schoolboy's task, the jailor's present, the drunkard's pawned pledge, the dotard's text-book, the irreverent jester's butt, the fanatic's justification for every vice, blasphemy, and profaneness which he commits. For into every one's hand it must needs be thrust, from the Chinese to the Ojibbawa, from the Laplander to the Bosjman, from the child to the dotard, from the stuttering peasant to the glib, self-righteous old dame. Now, when it is put into these hands, clean or unclean, there is no evidence given with it that it is what it is called, — the Word of God." And, we may ask, when the Romanist doctrines are offered to the same classes of persons, what evidence is given that they are either Scriptural or credible? The statutes enacted by each annual legislature of this State are, by law, distributed to each householder. If any, into whose hands they come, are unable to read them, or to understand them, or unwilling to conform themselves to them, the loss and risk are their own. But shall we therefore cease thus to publish abroad our laws? It is evident, however, that the great objection which the writer entertains to the free use of the Bible is because of its deficiencies; it does not contain what he thinks essential to *faith*. One who believes all that there is in it would not believe enough,

for it omits the doctrines most essential to salvation. Mark the boldness of the following assertion, which may be kept in memory, as alike one of the most frank allowances of a truth often insisted upon by Unitarians, and as a singularly daring implication that it is in the Roman Church, and not in its own statute-book, that the essentials of Divine truth are to be learned: — “As to faith, we should be almost ready to retract every word that we have written, if a well-attested case could be proved to us, of any one, left to learn religion from the Bible, having thence deduced the doctrine of the Trinity, or of one only God in three real persons; or that of the Divinity of our Lord, in its true sense, as consubstantial to the Father, as being one in person, and having two perfect natures. These are the two dogmas which the Church has considered essential to salvation, and fundamental of all revealed religion; yet we feel confident that no single person has ever discovered these for himself in the Bible, and that they are only believed by Bible Christians (where they *are* believed) in consequence of a self-deceit, or self-imposition, in fancying that they hold on Scripture evidence what in reality they only maintain because they have been so taught in church, that is, on the evidence of their clergyman.” There is a marvellous frankness in this confession; but could the writer have realized all its bearings and all the inferences which follow from it?

He proceeds to argue, that the use of the Scriptures is necessarily followed by distracting, sectarian, and demoralizing effects. The Bible, he says, “has, under the judicious management of evangelical missionaries, transformed a mild and promising race, in the dominions of Queen Pomare, into a pack of lazy, immoral infidels.” Now we would not attempt to offer a flat contradiction to all the points and specific proofs which enter into the argument of the writer. We are as keenly sensible as he is of the gross perversions, the poor superstitions, the ignorance, folly, bigotry, infidelity, and immorality, which may be traced, more or less directly, to the free use of the Bible. His argument is sound and good, as it exposes and bears upon the faithlessness of Protestants to their own principles, but not one whit farther. Protestants claim, and can justify the claim of private judgment in the use of Scripture. But having advanced the claim, they ought to be faithful to it; their safety depends upon their fidelity. And let it be understood, that to claim a right does not insure the right use of that right. When a man asserts his right to private judgment, he must not suppose that he thereby secures a sound, intelligent, and safe judgment. Herein lies the whole strength of the Jesuitical argument before us. Protestants have claimed the right of private judgment, but they have not exercised it; often, indeed, they have used the very *minimum* of judgment in dealing with the Scriptures, and all their errors have been consequent on this. Many have thought, that, when they had secured the liberty of reading the Bible, they had also possessed themselves of the intelligence and skill and candor and scholarship requisite for a clear and just understanding of its contents. But they have been egregiously mistaken. They might as well have looked to find that, when the Bible was opened before them, the dim-sighted would need no spectacles, and that it might be read by all without daylight or lamp-light. The *right* of private judgment implies the *exercise* of private judgment, and *judgment* is a word that means a great deal. It is hardly worth the logic of any Romanist to dispute the *right* of Protestants to apply their own noble

maxim to the Bible, on the ground that many of them fail to apply it. It would hardly do to deny the great right of personal property, because some people trifle away their money. How is it with our moral freedom, or with the independence and personal responsibility which come with the years of full manhood? These are granted to all, and if safely and judiciously improved they are blessings; but risks attend them, as risks attend the popular use of the Bible. Shall we put all men of twenty-one years of age under guardianship, lest they should not make the best use of the privileges granted to manhood? Shall we lock up the Bible, because men may not use the *judgment* which, it is asserted, is a safe interpreter of it? Shall we allow a Roman Catholic writer to argue against us as if we were so besotted as to suppose that a Bible operated like a charm, and as if we rendered null all our interest in mental and moral culture through which the Bible is to be made intelligible to us? If what we have said were not a sufficient reply to all that is just in the argument before us, we should go on to assert that, in ninety-nine cases out of each hundred in the experience of private life, the Bible does no harm; but, on the contrary, is a positive blessing, and a safe and intelligible guide even to its least cultivated readers. We shall not for one moment allow, that the excesses of fanaticism and folly, or the sharpness of sectarian strifes here and there, are any important off-set to the immense and untold sum of good which follows the use of the Bible in private life, under the guidance of common sense and a pure heart.

The article which we are criticizing concludes with the statement of three reasons, through force of which the Roman Church is justified in withholding the Scriptures from popular use. First, because "God has not given the Scriptures to all. They were not written till many generations of believers had passed away; and until the invention of printing, it was impossible that more than a very few persons could enjoy them." To this it may be answered, that after the Bible was completed, it became the standard, the criterion, the arbiter, or the trial-test for all the institutions and doctrines which were professedly warranted by it or drawn from it. So that those who claim to teach from it and by it should be willing to have it set over them. An honest executor of a will never objects that each of the heirs should have a copy of it. The second reason advanced is, that "God has not given to his Church the instinct moving her to circulate the Scriptures." This is rather an equivocal reason, for it may look to quite an opposite use to that for which it is adduced. That "the Church" lacks that *instinct*, may be one token that she is not what she assumes to be. The third reason is, that the fruits which have followed from the Protestant distribution of the Scriptures have not been such as to invite an imitation of that example,—a plea which brings us back to the former argument.

We are not of those who make an idol of the mere letter of the Bible. We would commend its perusal to all who will exercise their best gifts, and will humbly rely upon needful helps, as they do in other matters when their own resources fail them. We admit its easy liability to misuse. Still we think the zeal of all good Christians may be more profitably spent upon clearing its perplexities and extending the power of its lessons, than in burying it or in perverting it.

President Sparks and Lord Mahon. — We referred some months

since to the wholly unwarranted aspersions which Lord Mahon, following some anonymous newspaper-writers, had cast upon the editorial fidelity of President Sparks in his great work, entitled "The Writings of Washington." Lord Mahon has replied to the Letter in which, as the public voice almost unanimously declared, President Sparks had treated him with the utmost courtesy, while at the same time he thoroughly vindicated himself from the alleged unfaithfulness attributed to him by the British peer. In this reply, his Lordship retracts, and in a manner apologizes, for the grossest of the charges which he had advanced in the Appendix to his History, but he reiterates some of his minor charges, and offers specifications in proof of them. Had he consulted his own reputation for true courtesy, or for the qualities most valued and always to be looked for in one whose office is that of an historian, and who assumes to pronounce upon the labors of others, he would have stopped short with his apology. But he chose to renew his attack. He now accuses President Sparks of having been *unconsciously* influenced by two *motives*, which have interfered with his editorial fidelity. How a man can be *unconscious* of his *motives* is a question which we must give over to the transcendentalists. But if there be an intelligible sense in which such inconsistent states of mind can be connected together, — a sense unknown to us, — we may well say that the motives which Lord Mahon ascribes to the editor of Washington's Writings are of such a nature, that one who yielded to them could not possibly be *unconscious* of them; while the yielding to them in a way so marked as to have fulfilled their alleged purposes, and to fix the attention of so superficial an observer as Lord Mahon, would have required a full *consciousness* that documents must be constantly trifled with. The motives imputed are, to ascribe to Washington more stiffness of dignity than he possessed; and to conceal, for the sake of a local partiality, some of his severity of speech concerning New England. How admirably and thoroughly, as well as with what dignity and self-respect, President Sparks has repelled these charges, we recommend to our readers to inform themselves by perusing his second Letter to Lord Mahon.

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

Autumnal Unitarian Convention at Baltimore. — The annual gathering of ministers of our denomination, with delegates and volunteer representatives of our churches, is one of the occasions to which many persons are now wont to look forward with interest as the autumn comes with its bracing air. Though no intelligent person, who is acquainted with the spirit and the principles that distinguish our household of faith, expects that our conventions will result in quickening our merely sectarian zeal, or indeed in any striking demonstration of any kind, we are all concerned to feel that the time and travel and excitement and hospitality, and the show of purpose which they occupy and engage, are not wasted. Some effect they must have, for they cannot be merely nugatory. They either do harm, or they do good. And we are inclined to think, that, setting aside the question as to their general or public influence, as one the discussion of which would carry us too far, the question as to whether they injure or benefit any individual who takes

a part in them depends for its decision more upon himself, upon the frame of his own mind and the current of his sympathies, than upon any other contingencies. We certainly have ministers and laymen who say that they get no good from a convention. We can appreciate the reasons of this conviction, whether they are stated or not expressed. The draught which an attendance upon a religious convention makes upon the time of men who are busily tasked, the excitement connected with indefinite expectation, the unsatisfactoriness of a random debate, and the risk of an unprofitable one, with a sort of vague persuasion that no great good can come from an effort in which no specific purpose is had in view, — these are reasons by force of which many are deterred from going to such a gathering, while they likewise account for the little profit which some who do attend profess to derive from them. But on the other hand, if we were concerned to offer an argument in behalf of our conventions, — which we are not, preferring to leave them to their own unaided attractions, — we think we could both meet the force of the objections just stated, and add many strong reasons why our conventions must do good of some kind, and to some body. It is enough, however, to say, that as they are repeated from year to year, and have not lost their spirit, nor failed to be marked by some pleasing and encouraging tokens, they so far vindicate themselves.

In the Convention which was held at Baltimore, on the 26th, the 27th, and the 28th days of October last, there were memories and associations connected with the place of meeting sufficient in themselves to promote a religious effect. The temple of our faith in that city is the most perfect architectural structure on this continent, with the serious abatement, however, that the loftiness of its dome causes a loss of sound, so that only those who sit in the most favorable seats can hear distinctly the words of a speaker. But the edifice has a history, marked in its beginning by an event of signal importance in our denominational annals, and honorably illustrated by the faithful labors of men held in high regard among us. It was at the dedication of that church that the Rev. Dr. Channing preached, in 1819, the powerful and effective sermon which, while it stated our distinguishing views with, as we think, such an unanswerable force of argument, raised the storm of controversy that had been long impending. Those who heard the eloquent and most impressive speech made at the collation at Baltimore by the Rev. Dr. Gannett, the colleague and successor of Dr. Channing, will remember with what fervor and beauty of expression he reviewed the consequences following the delivery of that sermon, and remarked upon the labors of the distinguished men who had taught from the pulpit then consecrated. It was worth the journey to Baltimore to listen to that speech. There was present, too, at this Convention, as a delegate from Dr. Gannett's church, Deacon Samuel Greele, who went with Dr. Channing in the same capacity to the dedication of the church. In a pleasant and interesting train of reminiscences, he called back the occasion, and gave us a vivid idea of a time that seems to have long passed. What an advance has been made in the liberalizing and purifying of the creed of professed Christians in our communities since that time! We venture, without fear of contradiction, to assert in the plainest terms, that there are now some most popular and most approved ministers of the so-called Orthodox communion, who every Sabbath preach in a strain more liberal and un-Calvinistic on every point,

than did most of the Unitarian ministers at the time of the outbreak of the controversy. The assertion may be, and doubtless will be, denied; but he who shall undertake to prove to us that it is false, has a task in view which he had better estimate very carefully before he undertakes it.

The exercises which occupied the Convention during the three days of its session were morning meetings for conference and prayer, discussions, three occasions of public worship, and the administration of the Lord's Supper. The prayer-meetings were well attended, and their devotional influences were sought for, as tending to the best improvement of the other exercises of the Convention. The debates, as usual, took a wide range. The Business Committee furnished a list of subjects so large in their compass, as to admit of the introduction by the speakers of any topic which related to our denominational views, prospects, or duties. The relation held by our body to the other Christian communions was candidly discussed under the leading statement, that, as we differed from them in those peculiarities which designated some addition made by them to the essentials of Christian faith, and accorded with each and all of them in matters vital to the Gospel, our points of union and harmony are more important in every point of view than are our differences. Of course, so vague and loose a statement as this was admirably suited to start a debate, and the truth of it was conceded, without any oracular decision, to depend upon the contingency as to which party should be allowed the privilege of defining what are the *essentials* of Christian faith. As has been observed on a previous page of this number of our journal, there was a discussion in the Convention of the lack of, and of the best means of promoting, an earnest church life in our congregations. Wise words and quickening appeals were uttered, and were left to do their work without being compressed into resolutions, or committed to the doubtful agency of any specific measures.

At the three occasions of public worship, discourses were preached before the Convention as follows: on the evening of October 26th, by the Rev. Dr. Dewey of Washington, D. C., upon Religion, as a Fact, a Truth, and an Institution; on the afternoon of the 27th, by the Rev. George E. Ellis of Charlestown, on the Evangelical and the Philosophical Spirit in Religion; and on the evening of the 28th, by the Rev. Dr. Young of Boston, on the Ministry of Christ in taking away the Sin of Men. After this last service, and as the closing exercise of the Convention, the Lord's Supper was administered; the Rev. Samuel Osgood of New York, and the Rev. C. T. Thayer of Beverly, officiating at the table. Three days were thus profitably spent in religious interests which looked beyond any merely sectarian ends.

A social gathering, under one or another of the many agreeable forms for which the hospitality of friends where the Convention assembles may have a preference, always constitutes one of the pleasantest incidents of such an occasion. This was enjoyed at Baltimore under the most delightful circumstances. A new and spacious assembly-room, with all the conveniences for the comfort of a large company, and bountifully spread tables, with a hearty welcome from the president of the feast, were the outward solicitations which, united with fraternal and religious sympathies, were sure to impart the highest enjoyment. Several excellent speeches were made after the repast.

We cannot omit from our brief account of the Convention at Balti-

more, a passing notice of the constancy and the generosity which our brethren of that society have exhibited in the support of their great cause. Through intervals of discouragement, they have never failed in hopefulness or zeal or perseverance. We were especially pleased to see so large a number of our ministers present there, if only as a fraternal tribute to Dr. Burnap, who has so long labored at Baltimore with such distinguished devotion to his work.

A melancholy impression attaches to our otherwise most delightful memories of the Convention at Baltimore, from the bereavement which, so soon after its close, our body was called to sustain, in the loss of the Rev. Dr. Parkman. He was chosen as the Moderator of the Convention. Under the weight of a depression of spirits to which for several years he had been occasionally liable, he thought that he should be unequal to its duties, and attempted to decline them, though he consented to comply with the wishes of his brethren. He presided with much of his usual felicity of manner, and gave us, for the last time, the sympathy and pleasure of his services, as he had always loved to do in any way in which he could promote the happiness and advance the good of his brethren. His prayer at the opening of the pleasant social scene at the collation was touchingly expressed, and showed that the communication between his spirit and Him who heareth prayer was open to the utterances of a trusting and suppliant heart. We sorrow that we shall no more meet his friendly look, and that we shall no more enjoy on earth his genial presence. Our brethren at Baltimore must cherish as among the religious influences of their recent assembling of friends, that it was the last public scene on which our esteemed brother was to appear before our eyes.

Installation. — The Rev. EDMUND SQUIRE, recently from England, was installed as Pastor of the Second Hawes Congregational Society at SOUTH BOSTON, on December 1st. Introductory Prayer by the Rev. Lemuel Capen of South Boston; Selections from Scripture by the Rev. N. Hall of Dorchester; Sermon by the Rev. Dr. Gannett of Boston; Ordaining Prayer by the Rev. Dr. Lothrop of Boston; Charge by the Rev. C. Lincoln; Fellowship of the Churches by the Rev. J. I. T. Coolidge of Boston; Address to the Society by the Rev. John Corder of Montreal; Concluding Prayer by the Rev. S. B. Cruft of Boston.

Ordination. — Mr. COURTLAND Y. DE NORMANDIE, a graduate of the Meadville Theological School, was ordained as Pastor of the Unitarian Society in BROOKLYN, CONN., on December 1st. Introductory Prayer by the Rev. Henry Coe of Daryville, Conn.; Selections from Scripture by the Rev. D. E. Milland of Fall River; Sermon and Ordaining Prayer by the Rev. F. T. Gray of Boston; Charge by the Rev. T. W. Higginson of Worcester; Fellowship of the Churches by the Rev. J. Orrill of Providence, R. I.; Address to the Church and Society by the Rev. George G. Channing of Milton.

OBITUARIES.

REV. JOSEPH HARRINGTON died in San Francisco, California, Nov. 2, 1852, aged 39. The intelligence of this event has produced a profound

impression of grief throughout a large circle in New England and in the West. Mr. Harrington was one of the men that we know not how to spare. We can only bow in faith and submission to the decree which is mysterious and inscrutable. He has died with his armor on, in the prime of his years, just entering an admirable field of Christian service, full of energy and hope, and with the fairest prospects of success and usefulness.

He was a native of Roxbury, Mass., and was graduated at Harvard University in 1833. On leaving college he took charge of one of the grammar schools in Boston, and continued in it for several years with distinguished success. In the mean time, he privately pursued the study of theology, and was ordained in Boston in September, 1840, as an evangelist, and immediately proceeded to Chicago to assume a pastoral charge to which he had been invited in that city. He remained there five years, doing indeed the work of an evangelist. In April, 1846, he was installed as minister of the Church of the Saviour, a new Unitarian Church in Hartford, Conn. He continued in that relation, faithful, honored, and beloved, till the summer of the present year, when, having been selected as the best man that could be found to build up the Unitarian church in San Francisco, he considered it his duty to accept that distant and arduous mission. He had arrived at his new post, and believed that he saw his life's work before him. And so he did, but how brief! He preached a few times to a large and deeply interested congregation, and then sickened and died.

Mr. Harrington was a valuable man. He had done much good, and there was in him the promise of a great deal more. His mind was well endowed, and had been highly cultivated. Untiring industry and unswerving fidelity were virtues that he carried into every station. Energy and perseverance were a part of his nature. In the pulpit he had, in a high degree, some of the gifts of the true orator. His outward life and conversation had been blameless from his childhood up. Conscientious and upright, no man had aught against him, and his courtesy and kindness won him friends everywhere. With vivid religious sensibilities, and a firm, experimental, Christian faith, he loved his profession with all his heart, and labored in it with all his strength. Attached to his New England home by warm affections that had made him always a devoted son and brother, he had yet that earnestness of purpose, that zeal for Christian service, and that spirit of Christian enterprise, which enabled him to break away from so many whom he loved, and who loved him so well, and with faith and good cheer to seek his home on the opposite side of the continent. He seemed signally fitted for that new and peculiar sphere. The happiest results were expected from his ministry there; but he was permitted to continue it only long enough to earn an honored grave, and make his new people sincere mourners for him. Many fond and high hopes, associated there and here with him and his prospective labors, have been abruptly and sadly cut off. Sorrowfully, reluctantly, do we give him up so soon, but — God's will be done!

Died, in Boston, November 12, REV. FRANCIS PARKMAN, D. D., aged 65. Dr. Parkman, the son of an eminent Boston merchant, was born June 4, 1788, and was graduated at Cambridge in 1807. He commenced and pursued his theological studies for a time with the late

Dr. Channing, but completed them at the University of Edinburgh. On returning to this country, he was settled, in 1813, over the New North Church in Boston, of which he was the sole minister during twenty-nine years. At the close of this long period of faithful and laborious service, Rev. A. Smith was associated with him as colleague, in connection with whom he occupied the place of Senior Pastor till January 28, 1849, when he resigned his charge.

From the beginning of his professional life, Dr. Parkman filled a prominent place in that portion of the Christian Church to which he particularly belonged. As a preacher, his sermons were characterized by good sense, by their Scriptural and practical character, and by great felicity in his treatment of occasional topics. His devotional services were remarkable for their Christian fervor, their liturgical richness and simplicity, and for their singular appropriateness. His quick sympathies, his warm religious feelings, and his power of giving utterance to them through the choicest language of devotion, caused him to be constantly sought on occasions of public interest, to lead the devotional services of the assembled worshippers. In the pastoral relation he was ever diligent and faithful. His profession was the choice of his youth and the delight of his age. He loved every thing connected with it, and was profoundly interested in whatever could make it more efficient and useful.

He did not specially devote himself to any single department of scholarship, but he was a man of large and liberal culture, a lover of learning, and particularly familiar with whatever was of value in English theology. He took his full share among the early advocates of Unitarian views in this country, and did much to illustrate and defend them at a time when they were little understood and vehemently assailed.

He wrote with ease, and in a style always graceful, clear, and to the point. Numerous contributions from his pen may be found in the various Unitarian periodicals of this country, during the last thirty-five years. The Examiner has been largely indebted to him from the beginning. A great part of the biographical articles, which at the time were read with most interest, were from him. His large acquaintance with theological history and with men, his talent for perspicuous narrative, and a certain native humor, which diffused its light over all subjects where it could properly appear, qualified him in an eminent degree for this kind of writing. The only volume which he ever published was "The Offering of Sympathy," a book which has passed through repeated editions in this country and in England, and which has performed the office of a Christian comforter in many afflicted homes.

The cause of sound learning found in him a faithful friend, and his *Alma Mater* a generous and attentive son. The Parkman Professorship of Pulpit Eloquence and the Pastoral Care was founded by him. He took an active part in nearly all of the most important charitable institutions of this city, in many of which, as the Massachusetts Bible Society, the Humane Society, Medical Dispensary, the Society for Propagating the Gospel, the Society for the Relief of Aged and Destitute Clergymen, and the Congregational Charitable Society, he for years held offices which involved a great amount of labor, and a large expenditure of time. The different Reports which he prepared and published would, if collected, fill several good-sized volumes. No man was more faithful in performing the duties of every trust which he

accepted ; and it is not often that any one can be found, who will devote the same attention to objects whose only claim upon them is, that they are connected with the general welfare of the community.

Dr. Parkman's character was in some respects a marked and peculiar one. He was thoroughly honest and independent, active, social, and of unusually quick and warm sympathies. His genial and friendly nature made him seek society, and won for him a large circle of personal friends. He was a man of action, rather than speculation, and possessed the clearness and promptitude of mind and the methodical habits which in any sphere would have made him an efficient man of business. These qualities, united with much knowledge of men, with a quick sense of what was appropriate, with a conciliatory and gentlemanly bearing, and a great readiness in apprehending what the occasion demanded, caused him to be frequently selected as a presiding officer in the assemblies of his brethren. His last public act before his death was to preside over the Unitarian Autumnal Convention held at Baltimore.

Among those who best knew him, however, we think that the trait which would be first selected as most characteristic of him is kindness of heart. There was an honest sense of right about him, which enabled him, if the occasion demanded, to perform a painful act ; and no one was more able, if it was necessary, to utter a severe truth ; but the kindness of his nature took from the rebuke its barb, and healed the wound which itself had made. He made no proclamation of his benevolence ; he could refuse unreasonable demands, and was never one who gave merely because others had given. But what was better than this, he investigated and discriminated, and where there was any real claim, his benevolence, without waiting for the action of others, was abundant and persevering, and of a kind that sought retirement, rather than publicity. His labors in behalf of different benevolent institutions were only incidental to a far more extended private charity. He not only could not bear the sight of suffering, but the work that he most delighted in was that of promoting the happiness of others. In his death many poor families, over whose fortunes he had watched, have lost their best, their wisest and most faithful friend ; and the community has lost one of that small number to whom it could always look, and on whom it might with certainty rely, in every measure which gave the promise of promoting the cause of Christian truth or Christian charity.

It was, however, in his own profession that the characteristic of which we have spoken most prominently appeared. No one took a deeper interest in the young men of his profession, or greater pains to encourage them amidst their self-distrusts and misgivings, and to promote their welfare and usefulness. If any of his brethren were sick or in trouble, he seemed to be the first to know it, the first to cheer them by his presence, and to provide whatever their needs required. He had that beautiful quality of the heart which impelled him to give an unfailing and respectful attention to those with whom the world had gone hardly. How large and open was his hospitality, to friends and strangers, is well known ; but, better than this, and what gave the true idea of his character, few men carried out more literally the injunction of the Gospel, — when thou makest a feast, invite not thy rich neighbors, who will make a return, but rather those who can make no return. His last sermon in this city was on a subject upon which no one had a better

right to speak, — on being kind and tender-hearted. If there was any one whom others passed by, there he inevitably stopped. He was singularly considerate of the neglected and unfortunate. One of the petitions frequent in his prayers was for those who had known better days, and with him it was a petition full of meaning. For years past, no single thing occupied his thoughts more than the relief of aged, sick, or destitute members of his own profession. He was liberal of pecuniary aid, while the manner doubled the value of the gift. He acted himself, and enlisted the sympathy of others. After his connection with a particular parish ceased, for long periods of time, nearly every Sabbath was given to those who, from sickness, need, or some other adversity, could be benefited by his friendly offices. It may be doubted if any year of his life was ever more actively, usefully, and benevolently laborious than the last; and his labors were of a kind for which there is no return of gain or fame, but only the consciousness of usefulness.

Though subject to seasons of depression, his temperament was unusually cheerful, genial, and sunshiny, and it gave its own character to his religious feelings. How strong those feelings were, was well known to those familiar with him. They colored his views of life, they controlled his notions of duty, and appeared impressively in those devotional exercises which carried with them the hearts of all who heard them.

It is pleasant to dwell on these remembrances of one who was constantly more loved and valued the more intimately he was known. Few men could leave behind so large a circle of friends; and after a long and active life, notwithstanding his frankness of speech and independence of action, we do not believe that he left behind him a single unkind memory in the heart of any human being. A countenance ever friendly has disappeared from the paths of life; we shall miss his warm greeting, his ready and active sympathy, and his labors in so many departments of Christian usefulness. The epitaph which might with truth be written over his tomb is one which any man might rejoice to have: — He will be missed by his friends; he will be missed in a home which was ever made bright by his cheerful, confiding, and thoughtful affection; he will be missed in the community, to the support of whose institutions he was so ready to contribute thought and time and money and labor; he will be missed in every charitable enterprise, which needs the help of good men; he will be missed in the families of the poor, which for him had a more potent attraction than the dwellings of the prosperous; he will be missed by strangers who enjoyed his hospitality; and still more, he will be missed by those whom the world neglects, by those unfortunate and destitute and sometimes unattractive persons whose wants he sought out in their obscurity, and whose claims were all the more sacred to him because they were the most likely to be overlooked. But above all, apart from his own kindred, he will be missed by his brethren in his own profession, among whom his reconciling, harmonizing spirit, his friendly readiness in all Christian works, his large experience, and his judicious counsels, made him a centre of regard and of good influences. But the qualities for which he will be remembered are the same qualities which, now he has gone, enable those who remain, to look up with cheerful trust to Him, whose best promises are given to those who on the earth have helped the destitute, have cared for the sick, have fed the hungry, and clothed the naked, and served God by endeavoring to be useful among men.